UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. VIII SPRING, 1956 No. 1

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.
Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft's Concept of Unity

IVAN SZEWCIW
Archbishop Andrew Szeptycky and Ukrainian Reunion

MARIO DA ABIY-ADDI, O.F.M. Cap.
The future of Christianity in Ethiopia

BERNARD LEEMING, S.J.
"Catholic and Protestant"

T. BOWYER CAMPBELL
Anglican Positions

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
A German Bishop Discusses Christian Unity
German Protestants and the Papacy
The Religious Situation in Russia - a Statement by American Churchmen
The Role of Women in the Protestant Ministry

ECUMENISM AND REUNION - AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

P 15818

Imprimatur:

✠ Aloysius Traglia

Archiepus Caesarien Vicegerens

April, 1956

DR. W. A. VISSER'T HOOFT'S CONCEPT OF UNITY

It was with the closest attention that I recently read an article dealing with Christian unity by Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches. (1) This is an article which seems to provide us with ground for fruitful discussion. Indeed, I for one, could accept its concluding statement without any reservation: "We stand for the unity given by the Chief Shepherd who knows only one flock." In the light of this conclusion, would it not be possible for us to elucidate its premises? And if, as is quite probable, there is no question here of a conclusion but of a principle which is recognized as primary and indisputable, could we not collate with it that conception of unity which is presented to us?

Dr. Visser 't Hooft puts the question before us quite clearly. On the one hand, the World Council speaks of the unity of the Church and makes a profession of that unity. One should even say that its *raison d'être* is to promote this unity. On the other hand, because it possesses no doctrinal authority, the Council must take care not to have its own doctrine on the unity of the Church. In actual fact, the churches which make it up have divergent conceptions of that unity. Since they are not in agreement on the nature of the Church, they cannot be so on that which its fundamental character demands — that it is to be one Church and not several. All that the World Council can do is to convene its member-churches so that together they may search into the true nature of the unity willed by Christ. It would seem, therefore, that when the Council refers to the unity of the Church, it leaves to each one the right of understanding that term in his own way and does not itself proffer any exact or obligatory meaning as much. However, this is not the case. Although Dr. Visser 't Hooft maintains that the World Council does not impose any particular view, he feels that the member-churches have in common already reached certain conclusions on the nature of unity. In consequence, the World Council can be said to imply these same conclusions when it speaks of unity. One cannot, therefore, reproach it for employing a term which is devoid of meaning.

The General Secretary of the World Council of Churches knows better than anyone else the possibilities and the limits of that institution. I would even say that the way he indicates for the quest of unity is the only one accessible to the member-churches of different confessions: to seek together the authentic plan of Jesus Christ for His Church and the unity which that Church must possess. I would also add that in my opinion this task is so fundamental and urgent that it should absorb all the activity of the Council. For after all, as long as the will of Christ has not been determined, can one be sure

(1) In the *Ecumenical Review*, October 1955, pp. 18-19.

NO LONGER THE PROPERTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

that he is not availing himself against that will of a powerful organization which the aspiration towards unity has brought into being?

That unity must exist is a matter of conviction with Dr. Visser 't Hooft, and he manifests this by happily making use of not only the scriptural texts usually cited but also of the entire Biblical teaching of both the Old and New Testaments which deals with the one people of God. Grace is at work to gather this people together. Perhaps the General Secretary has not sufficiently observed that what is not yet gathered together does not at all form part of the chosen people. Be that as it may, this apology for unity is one that should be retained.

Our non-Catholic friends know that in this publication it has been our constant concern to evaluate everything from the Catholic point of view. In this we feel that we are being of service not only to Catholics but also to all those who wish to compare their own doctrines with those of Rome. With this in mind, then, I should like to set down here the reflections and the reservations which the proposals of Dr. Visser 't Hooft have suggested to me.

In the first place, does the search for Christian unity on the part of the World Council possess the desired amplitude? Have its members asked themselves whether they were not presupposing very much or even whether they were not presupposing the essential? In the official publications of the Council, as also in the present article under discussion, a theology of the Church is presumed, but one which has not been able to be demonstrated. Discussion has centered about a Church which has been called truly one, to which the 169 member-churches of the Council (and others as well) belong, despite the very great differences which divide them. Only one article of faith is required for membership in the World Council: a belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ. But this belief cannot suffice to constitute a Church.

Jesus asked for the unity of those who would believe in Him: He did not therefore consider them as already being one by the very fact that they believed in Him. It goes without saying that Christ, in whom His followers believe, is Himself *one*. But what we are concerned with here is not the unity of Christ but with that of those who believe in Him and who nevertheless profess doctrines which are mutually opposed. They are simply *not* one, nor can they give unity to a Church. If one Church exists, she cannot incorporate them all; for with them she would no longer be one Church but several. The World Council, therefore, should propose for discussion that which it presupposes and inquire into what conditions are necessary before one can speak of the one Church of Jesus Christ.

Another preliminary question presents itself at this juncture. The World Council examines its various problems in its assemblies as well as in the many conferences of its Central Committee and of its different sections. Let us suppose that on a particular doctrinal point the delegates should happen to be in agreement, even unanimously. Would this mean that one could hold this point without fear of error? What

authority could guarantee it? The Council itself does not claim to be infallible. Could not, then, the Bible be invoked? But who can insure that the interpretation given is exact, especially when the latter has required an arduous investigation in order to be accepted? The most that can be said is that the member-churches will be in agreement on a growing number of propositions, but without, on that account, insuring an advancement towards the truth.

According to Dr. Visser 't Hooft, what actually are the characteristics of that unity which the investigation of the World Council has brought to light? The General Secretary gives the following enumeration of them in his article, together with the documentation in which they may be found. After each point we are appending a brief commentary of our own:

(a) *The unity of the Church is a* given *unity, in that it has its essential reality in Jesus Christ Himself.*

Certainly, the unity of the Church is given, just as the Church itself is given; but it is not the unity of its Head alone. It is something realized upon earth from the Cross until the Last Judgment. It is a reality where one finds the same faith, the same worship, and the same government. All else outside this unity cannot belong to the Church of Christ except by desire.

(b) *This unity must be made manifest to the world.* This point is exact. The unity of the Catholic Church is manifest. It is this characteristic which ever since the time of St. Augustine has been invoked to justify the Church's claim to be the true Church of Christ. If all Christians were to enter into this unity, the latter would not become more perfect but simply more striking, as the effect of a greater miracle.

(c) *Full church unity must be based on a large measure of agreement in doctrine.* Unity of doctrine is absolutely required. It is necessary for each of the faithful to believe everything that Holy Church believes and teaches.

(d) *Sacramental communion is a necessary part of full church unity.* This is most assuredly the case. This is true both for the Eucharist and for the other Sacraments.

(e) *A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church and some permanent organ of conference and counsel are required, but a rigid uniformity of governmental structure or a structure dominated by a centralised administrative authority are to be avoided.* I presume that by this last aspect is meant only the possibility of excessive centralisation and not the government of the Church of Rome which is entirely subordinate to the Pope; if it should be otherwise, then this anti-Roman stand would not be very ecumenical and, even worse, would not be very much in conformity with the well-known text of St. Matthew, XVI, 16-19.

(f) *The unity of the Church depends on the renewal of the*

Church. We should say rather that the unity of Christians depends on the renewal of Christians.

(g) *This unity is not to be sought for its own sake only, but for the sake of the world in which the Church performs its mission of evangelism.* Actually, Christ did say: "That they all may be one ... that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."

Dr. Visser 't Hooft sees in the World Council, by the very fact of its existence, the proof that God is gathering its members together. The Instruction promulgated by the Holy Office with reference to the relations of Catholics with their separated brethren also sees the action of the Holy Spirit, if not in the World Council, itself, at least in the aspiration towards unity which gave it birth. Everything leads us to believe, in effect, that in our day God is calling upon Christians to unite. It is up to each one to ask himself whether he is making that personal effort which the realization of unity requires. What a splendid thing it would be to see the World Council of Churches dedicating itself above all to the task of guiding its members towards real Christian unity!

Christ acknowledges but one fold. This our separated brethren know and profess. Accordingly, they should have a kind of obsession for this unity willed by Christ. At the same time, however, one cannot dissimulate the reality and the depth of the divisions created in the course of history. We are permitting ourselves the hope, therefore, that the World Council, by prayer, by earnest effort, and by effective action will encounter the causes of disunion: that it will expose error, denounce prejudice, and reject predetermined positions. This would not be too much to ask in view of all the means it has at its command to carry through such a vast and arduous undertaking.

At this point, someone might ask: Do you think that this effort, pursued faithfully and unreservedly, will lead us into the fold of the Church of Rome? My reply to this would be that no Catholic doubts it. But what reason is there to be afraid? For the present, you are asked only to pray, to seek, and to knock. Indeed, I am well aware that there are many in the World Council who recognize this exigency and are acting upon it.

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

ARCHBISHOP ANDREW SZEPTYCKY AND UKRAINIAN REUNION

A good deal has been written concerning the late Metropolitan of the Catholic Church in Western Ukraine, Mgr. Andrew Szeptycky, but many details of his life and of his extraordinary work are still unknown to the world at large.

Andrew Szeptycky was born in 1865 in Western Ukraine (known as Eastern Galicia), at that time under Austrian rule. His family owned vast estates, and he succeeded to great wealth. While following the austere life of a monk, he was at the same time an artist and protector of the arts, a scholar, teacher, preacher, writer, and missionary. He was also an organiser, founder and reformer of religious orders and congregations, and of various charitable institutions for the material welfare as well as for the religious advancement of his large and far-flung flock. He was, in addition, a restorer of the Eastern tradition in the Ukraine and a fearless fighter for social and political justice. Those who knew him intimately describe him as an ascetic, endowed with striking spiritual gifts, a man of continual prayer.

Some of my readers may recall their great pleasure of assisting at the pontifical Masses celebrated by Mgr. Szeptycky at Notre Dame de Paris in 1925, on the occasion of the sixteenth centenary of the Nicean Synod; or at his Masses said in several places in England. Others will recall his endeavours for the welfare of his spiritual flock in Canada, the United States, and South America; his conferences and conversations replete with a deep and extensive knowledge of the East; and his prayers and solicitude for the reunion of the dissident Churches with the Holy See.

The greatest preoccupation of Metropolitan Szeptycky during the whole of his life was the reunion of the Orthodox East — above all, that of the Ukraine — with the Catholic Church. His interest in the problems of Christian unity can be traced back to his early youth. Although he himself came from a family which had come under Polish influence and joined the Latin Rite, Andrew Szeptycky took an interest in the East and in the thought and rite of his ancestors at an early age. He became familiar with the Slav-Byzantine tradition when a young student at law in 1887, during his stay in Kiev, where he made up his mind to work for the union of the Eastern Church with that of the West. As a young count he visited Moscow and St. Petersburg where he studied Russian religious painting and architecture; there he likewise became personally acquainted with Solovyev and his works, which strongly impressed him and confirmed his determination.

Andrew Szeptycky was named metropolitan of Halych, Western Ukraine, in 1901, and from the very first his thoughts turned to the reunion of the millions of his separated Orthodox countrymen in the

Eastern Ukraine. However, because of the restrictions imposed by the tsarist regime, which was hostile to Catholicism — especially so to that of the Byzantine Rite — and because of the misunderstanding on the part of the Orthodox that union would mean "Romanisation" and "Polonisation," little could at first be done in that direction. In 1906 the energetic young metropolitan organized a large pilgrimage to the Holy Land, which not only enkindled the hearts of the participants but also drew attention to the existence of other Catholics of the Byzantine Rite in Europe and aroused interest in reunion among both Latin Catholics and Orthodox.

The hope of Metropolitan Andrew to found a monastery under St. Theodore the Studite's rule for Slavic priests and monks in Palestine did not materialise because of the first World War. But he was one of the chief benefactors — now unfortunately forgotten — who founded the Russian Catholic Church of St. Laurence ai Monti in Rome in 1910. He was also one of the principal initiators of the theological conferences of Catholic and Orthodox theologians at Velahrad in Moravia, at which congresses he often presided himself, or else sent his representatives.

Metropolitan Szeptycky felt the great need of doing something positive about reunion in Russia proper. Having been authorised by Pope Pius X, who regarded him as the best qualified representative of the Catholic Church in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Russia, he sent a score of priests to minister to Russian Catholics; and he himself set out incognito to Russia to visit the small group of Russian Catholics of Byzantine Rite there and to get in touch with those Orthodox bishops favourable to reunion. At that time he also visited the Byelorussian Catholics.

In Russia Metropolitan Andrew began conversations with Bishop Innocent of the Old Believers (*Staroviery*), but the latter's attitude as well as that of other clergymen and lay people was ambiguous. In spite of their sympathy towards the idea of reunion, they did nothing about it, with the exception of one priest. The Metropolitan also kept in touch with Ivan Luckevich and others concerned with a renascence among the Byelorussian people, and had the intention of sending a number of Ukrainian Catholics to Byelorussia to spread the idea of union there. The government, however, learned of this plan and took steps to prevent it.

The tsarist regime saw in the person of Metropolitan Andrew, as the representative of Eastern Catholicism, a dangerous opponent and looked for an opportunity to thwart his work. It soon came. During the Russian occupation of Lviv in 1914, the Metropolitan preached a sermon to the effect that his faithful should come closer to their Eastern brethren and criticised the latter's Orthodoxy as being too much controlled by the State. This furnished sufficient grounds for the interning of the Metropolitan by the Russians and his deportation to the interior of the Empire. During his three year imprisonment,

Szeptycky, whenever possible, established contacts with those Orthodox bishops and priests whom he knew to have broader views in church matters and endeavoured to win them over to the idea of union. His forced stay in Russia is worthy of special study.

Having attained his release as a result of the Revolution of 1917 and the intervention of certain Orthodox clergy and lay people, Metropolitan Szeptycky went to St. Petersburg. There he created an exarchate for the Russian Catholics of the Byzantine Rite, with Leonid Fyodorov at its head, and obtained for it governmental recognition from the responsible ministry in the temporary government at Lviv. He presided at the first eparchical synod in which Exarch Fyodorov, six priests, and some lay people participated. The main concern of the meeting was relations with the Orthodox. Shortly after the synod, the Metropolitan visited Moscow where he called on Archbishop Peter of Smolensk whom he knew to be favourably disposed towards Catholicity. During the talks with him he realized that the Catholic sympathies of Archbishop Peter, although real and sincere, were held back by elements of fear from being manifested publicly. The same proved to be the case with the Orthodox Bishop Tryfon who most likely would have been designated as the first Catholic Bishop of the Byzantine Rite in Russia.

Some time after his trip to Moscow, Metropolitan Andrew went to Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine, and there he was received with great honour. *Centralna Rada* (the Central Committee welcomes you) was the term with which the Orthodox at Kiev greeted the Catholic Metropolitan. To prove that union with Rome has nothing to do with "Romanisation" or "Polonisation," Mgr. Szeptycky publicly celebrated a solemn liturgy in Kiev and preached in Ukrainian. Before his departure, he established a vicariate for the whole Eastern Ukraine with Father Michael Cehelsky at its head. With the help of Orthodox Ukrainians, Father Cehelsky built a beautiful church in Carpathian style in Kiev where sermons used to be preached regularly in Ukrainian; these attracted many Orthodox faithful and gave further impetus to the idea of a Ukrainian Orthodox Church on an autocephalous basis. Similar churches and groups of Catholics of the Byzantine Rite were founded in Odessa, Poltava, Katerynoslav, and other cities of the Ukraine. The successor of Cehelsky, Fr. Shchepaniuk, was deported by the Bolsheviks to Siberia and later died there.

There came a time when it seemed that the union so dear to Mgr. Szeptycky might materialise. This was in 1918 when the Ukrainian Orthodox broke off from the Moscow patriarchate, and a part of the clergy and people desired to form a separate Ukrainian patriarchate under the leadership of Andrew Szeptycky. The foremost personalities of the Eastern Ukraine, although themselves Orthodox, intended to accept the Ukrainian Catholic Church as the state Church in the Ukraine in order to be independent from Moscow once and for all; and Szeptycky was to be appointed its metropolitan, or rather its

patriarch. He was ready to accept the election on the condition, however, that the whole proceeding should be submitted for approval to the Holy See. This scheme came to naught with the fall of the Ukrainian State.

After World War I, Metropolitan Szeptycky served as Apostolic Visitor in a three year journey to the countries of the Americas and of Western Europe. There he visited different Catholic centres, and especially seminaries and religious communities, everywhere arousing a lively interest in the Eastern Church and the reunion of the East with the Holy See. Under his influence there was founded the *Apostolaat der Hereniging* (Apostolate of Union) in Holland, whose members in addition to the work of prayer for its exalted purpose have continued to offer material aid to their eastern brothers. It was also not without his persuasion that various religious orders adopted the Byzantine Rite and began to work for the reunion of the separated East. This was particularly true of the Benedictines and the Redemptorists in Belgium. In England, too, which the Metropolitan visited at least twice, his beneficent influence was felt. He likewise contributed very seriously to the foundation of the training college for the priesthood at Enghien in Belgium for young men from Russia.

No matter what artificial, political, or religious frontiers were set up by opponents of the Ukrainian people, Metropolitan Andrew always brought consolation and encouragement to his Orthodox brethren. During the German occupation of the Ukraine from 1941-44, he was ready to provide spiritual help for them and endeavoured to send them priests; but the German occupation authorities forced him to abandon his efforts, except for occasional and very interesting contacts that received no publicity.

In regard to the fondest dream of Metropolitan Andrew — the reunion of East and West — life did not spare him painful blows, both those on the part of the tsarists and Bolshevist Moscow and those of Catholic Poland whose government saw in such a reunion the strengthening and the growth of the Ukrainians. In order to prevent this, the government tried to take the endeavour into its own hands in the Ukrainian and Byelorussian territories which came to Poland after the Riga treaty with the U.S.S.R. in 1921, and Szeptycky was excluded from it.

A severe setback to the cause of unity, the consequences of which are still felt, was again caused by Poland in her arrogant sequestration of Orthodox churches in the Cholmshchyna and Pidlasia regions. It was the Vatican this time that the Polish government wished to make an accomplice of its political policies in order to undermine the confidence of the Ukrainians and and to provoke them against Rome. Whereas the Polish Catholic bishops passed over this action of the Polish government in silence, Mgr. Szeptycky stood up in defence of those who were wronged. In a "Letter to the Orthodox" he pilloried this crime, pointed out who was really guilty, and explained to the

people the aim of this new provocation. Although this letter was confiscated, it nevertheless found its way into the western Catholic world, and on the part of the Orthodox letters of appreciation were sent to the Metropolitan.

By his attitude of kindness towards the Orthodox, Szeptycky won their sympathy and respect for himself and his ideas on church reunion. Although biased against the thought of reunion, they were captivated by his personality — the "Ukrainian Moses" they called him. As examples of that Christian gentleness of heart and breadth of spirit, we may mention how he hospitably received the Orthodox Bishop Evlohy, who had chiefly contributed to Szeptycky's own deportation by the Russians in 1914. Worthy of note also is his defence of the Orthodox bishops and priests persecuted by the first Bolsheviks and at the time of the artificially produced famine in the Ukraine in 1933. Mention may likewise be made of his reception of the Orthodox hierarchy in 1943, and other instances as well.

After the autocephalous Ukrainian Orthodox Church had been set up in 1941-44, Metropolitan Andrew, first turned his attention towards agreement and mutual understanding and issued a number of letters and appeals to the Orthodox bishops and people of the Ukraine in order to bring about a reunion between them and Catholics, for he believed that the time for such unification had come. The most important of these letters is the one entitled, "To all Orthodox Bishops in the Ukraine and Ukrainian Territories." Besides making an appeal in this letter of December 30th, 1941, for the union of the churches from the religious point of view as well as the national and patriotic, he proposed three conditions for unity: namely, that the hierarchy of both churches, Catholic and Orthodox, should before all desire unity and prepare their clergy and people so that they themselves should spontaneously wish the union of their churches; that prayers should be made on both sides for this holy purpose and on a national scale; that preparation be made for inevitable adjustments and sacrifices on both sides.

Unfortunately, the Orthodox bishops did not understand, or perhaps did not want to understand, the appeal of Metropolitan Andrew. In the replies received by him it was stated that "no real wish for an *approchement* appears." Even if theoretically it was admitted that union of the various Ukrainian religious bodies was necessary for national unity, none of them was thinking about the mutual approach of various Ukrainian Orthodox churches to each other. (1)

The replies of the Orthodox bishops were negative and most unencouraging. The synod of bishops in its answer not only declined any

---

(1) Mgr. Szeptycky in *Lvivski Archyeparchyalni Vidomosty,* No. 3-4, pp. 32 ff. Lviv, 1943. By "Orthodox" the Metropolitan means the Catholic Church also, which appears in the liturgical books of the Ukrainian Catholic Church as "Orthodox" in its full meaning.

effort for reunion with Rome, but clearly and unconditionally required the Ukrainian Catholic Church to turn Orthodox, in the usual meaning of the word. All other appeals and private letters of the Metropolitan to individual Orthodox bishops met with either a negative or an elusive response. A score of bishops did not answer at all. It should be noted that Andrew Szeptycky himself favoured the autocephalous church because he believed that there might come from it a renaissance of the Ukrainian people and their return to Rome.

Knowing that in the East and particularly in the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church an important part was being played by the lay intelligentsia, Metropolitan Andrew also addressed himself to them with a similar appeal. He was fully aware that a complete unification of the Ukrainian churches could not come about all at once, but as in other letters so in this he appeals for mutual approach, understanding of one another, and for proper adjustment. For himself he asks no distinction in any future unified church in the Ukraine and is prepared to subordinate himself to the Kiev metropolitan elected from among the Orthodox clergy — this, however, on the condition that the latter will be in communion with the Catholic Church. The answers of the laity were also negative, trivial, and in some cases even offensive. Such a dissentient attitude must be ascribed to certain unfavourable historical and political circumstances accompanying the federation of the Ukraine with Moscow in 1654; the subordination of the Kiev metropolitanate to the Moscow patriarch in 1686, on the one hand, and arbitrary Polish activities on the other; and to the dislike of the Russian Orthodox for the Catholic Church in general and for the Byzantine Rite Catholics in particular, a dislike with which the majority of the Orthodox Ukrainians were themselves imbued. It should be noted, nevertheless, that there is an element among the intelligentsia of the latter group at the present time which desires union of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church with Rome. The adherents of this group have as their organ the magazine, *Ukraine in the World,* which is published in Germany under the direction of Mr. I. Sapiha.

* * *

It would be of interest to say something of the theoretical concepts of Metropolitan Andrew regarding the union of the Ukrainian churches, for his thoughts on the subject are also important for other Orthodox bodies. The conception of Mgr. Szeptycky is to be considered under two aspects: first, what position would be held by the Orthodox after a future reunion with the Catholic Church; and secondly, the manner in which this future all-Ukrainian Church would have to be organized within herself.

1. It should be said that in the opinion of Szeptycky himself the Catholic Church, particularly in the East, is often wrongly understood. The people there often see in her an adversary that would make them renounce their nationality, tradition, etc. "It seems to them that only

their form of Christianity is true and that Catholicism in its very essence is tied up with 'Romanitas' and the West. They think that to become a Catholic means to go over to the Latin Rite and to a Western nationality in the bargain" (*Letter on Ritual Matters,* Lviv, 1931). Kyr Andrew understood all the complexity and seriousness of the matter; and despite all the obstacles and difficulties created by opponents as well as by followers who did not understand his far-sighted views, he strove all his life through to bring about a suitable psychological basis and atmosphere for mutual understanding, respect and love; and this not only in obviously important matters but also in seemingly less important ones.

Metropolitan Andrew saw that those of the Eastern tradition should have, as far as possible, the place in the Catholic Church which would have been theirs had there not been any schism of the churches. "And it is well known," he writes, "that the Eastern patriarchs used to have a disciplinary and administrative autonomy. Patriarchates are suitable to the idea of national churches as far as they are possible within the organisation of one Catholic Universal Church." (2)

Szeptycky was well aware that the Eastern churches are national to a greater extent than is the Catholic Church among the various peoples of the West. But the national character of churches is not incompatible with the wide concept of Catholicity as long as the patriotic aspect does not become "nationalistic." In his letters the Metropolitan emphasised that the Orthodox have nothing to fear that, having united with the Catholic Church, they would have to renounce any of the characteristics, customs, or ritual of the Orthodox Church. They would lose nothing; they would only gain. (3)

2. In order to return to the Ukrainian Church her former dignity and to separate her definitively from the Moscow patriarchate, Kyr Andrew wished that, should the unification of the Ukrainian churches be effected, there should be created a Ukrainian patriarchate with its seat in the capital city of Kiev. (4)

In the opinion of Szeptycky, this Ukrainian Church should have, except for the recognition of the supreme jurisdiction of the Roman patriarch, the Pope, a full autonomy, almost equal to autocephaly. "Individual churches in communion and relation with all other churches in the West, could preserve a very far-reaching autonomy, which could even be called autocephaly, because it would not mean such a dependence and subordination of the patriarchate to the Holy See as is the case for particular bishoprics in the West. The tie linking a particular patriarch to the Pope would be of a very different kind." (5)

United with the Holy See, the Ukrainian Church would still pre-

---

(2) "Das Russische Katholische Exarchat" in *Ex Oriente,* Mainz 1927, pp. 81-2.

(3) *Ex Oriente,* 1927, pp. 78-89; and "Propaganda vidstupstva" in *Lvivski Archyeparchyalny Visty,* No. 12, 1942.

(4) "V spravi porozuminnia" in *Lvivski Arch. Visty,* nos. 3-4, pp. 43-44, 1943.

(5) Ibid. p. 43.

serve all her church practices and national traditions. And the question of the use of the contemporary Ukrainian language (used in the autocephalous church) in the liturgy in this united church of the Eastern Ukraine was contemplated by the Metropolitan. (6) The Ukrainian patriarch and the Kiev metropolitan in one person, according to Szeptycky's idea, would be elected from among the Orthodox clergy, and Kyr Andrew himself was prepared to subordinate himself to him in the event that the latter should establish himself in communion with the Catholic Church.

Thanks to Andrew Szeptycky, the problem of church union again took its place in men's minds in central and eastern Europe. He was a true apostle of the Slavs. It was his desire to teach the millions of Slavs to sing their *Viruiu (Credo)* with one heart and one voice. To this great mission he devoted his life. Filled with work for the Church, and in the national sphere as well, crowned with the glory of a good shepherd, he ended his long, holy, and active life on November 1st, 1944, in his house on St. George's Hill at Lviv, leaving millions of his flock in the Ukraine and abroad afflicted with grief. And it would be wrong to think that after the compulsory aggregation of Ukrainian Catholics within the Russian Orthodox Church, brought about by the Soviet Government in 1945-46, any question of reunion is at an end. Not at all, for it is necessary for the grain to die before it can bring forth a future harvest by the hundreds, thousands, and millions in the church union field ploughed and sown by that man of great vision, Metropolitan Andrew Szeptycky.

IVAN SZEWCIW

---

(6) *Lvivski Archyeparchyalny Visty*, no. 6, pp. 102. Lviv, 1942.

THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIANITY IN ETHIOPIA

(The view of an Ethiopian Catholic priest)

In dealing with the reunion of the separated churches of the East — a problem which demands unusual application and energy because of its extensive scope — the dissenting church of Ethiopia deserves special attention.

First of all, the number of its followers is considerable: the Ethiopian Church counts almost seven millions among its adherents; and so, among the separated churches, its membership is second only to the Byzantine, or Orthodox, Church; although the latter, as we know, claims a much larger number — more than 130 millions. Furthermore, the return of the Ethiopian Church to Catholic unity would be a major step in the future of Christianity throughout the whole of Africa. The Ethiopians, with their glorious record of constant loyalty to the Christian faith and of their singular attachment to the See of Peter, clearly show a special call from God in the role of bringing all Africa to the Catholic faith.

There are certain events in the history of Africa which cannot be remembered without being moved by them. We cannot forget the place once occupied by the African Church in the times of early Christianity: it was the greatest part, the most flourishing branch on the vine of the Universal Church!

Let us for the moment recall its famous Pope, St. Victor; its bishops, St. Cyprian, St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Cyril, and so many others; its great doctors, Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, and Augustine the giant of Catholic theology; its renowned theological school at Alexandria; its Councils, which effectively enabled the Catholic Church to confront various distressing heresies; its cathedrals, numerous churches, and monasteries; its numerous clergy, its hermits (St. Pachomius and St. Anthony), and its fervent Christians.

Unfortunately, only the memory of all that splendour remains today. Practically all has been destroyed and utterly submerged under the tossing waves and the avalanches first of the Vandals, and then of Islam. In the regions of Egypt, Lybia, Tunisia, Carthage, Morocco, and all the Mediterranean coast of Africa, Mohammedanism reigns today; just as formerly, Christianity flourished. They are now entirely under the dominion of Islam. It is one of the greatest reverses in history.

If it is possible to speak of the defeats of the Catholic Church, this would certainly be the greatest and most stunning in the vicissitudes of its history. When the surging tide was unleashed, it destroyed the flowering African Church, while Ethiopia was still in the infancy of its Christianity. Although the Moslems attacked Ethiopia time and time again with repeated obstinacy and determination, it alone, out of all Africa, succeeded in keeping intact and without interruption its Christ-

ian faith, showing a heroism which can never be duly praised. In this extraordinary occurrence we see once more the Hand of God, and Ethiopia's special place in the future of Christianity throughout Africa.

The attachment to the See of Peter and to Rome is perhaps the most outstanding characteristic which most of all distinguishes the Ethiopian Church from the rest of the separated churches.

The entire history of Christian Ethiopia, from its forced separation and isolation up to the present day, reflects a continual longing to be joined once more in communion with Rome. In Ethiopia's history rulers have sent many representatives to the Holy See, desirous of renewing sound relations with the successor of St. Peter, the Bishop of Rome. In times past, we can recall the commission of Zer'a Jacob in 1442 to Eugene IV; of Eskende II to Sixtus IV in 1481; of Ghelawdewos to Paul III in 1545; of Dawit, or Lebne-Denghel, to Clement VII in 1532. In more recent times we can bring to mind those of Menelik II to St. Pius X in 1907; of Menelik's nephew and successor, Lig-Jasù to Benedict XV in 1915; of the Empress Zeuditù to the same Pope in 1921, and the visit of the present Emperor Haile Sillasie to Pius XI in 1924. (All the representations to the successor of St. Peter unanimously expressed, with sincere devotion and deference, their deep regret at the departure of their country from the true Church, and assured him of their great esteem.)

But unfortunately, the ardent desire of Ethiopian Christians for reunion with Rome has not been realised, owing to so many difficulties raised from outside by the Moslems and the Patriarchs of Alexandria. The latter conveniently invented a pseudo-Nicene Canon, by which the Ethiopians were constrained to remain permanently united with them; and they rigorously controlled and prevented any relations with Rome and rest of Christendom.

It follows that although this long isolation and lack of contact with the living *magisterium* of the Church have not succeeded in extinguishing the Christian faith in Ethiopia, they have nevertheless weakened and loosened its ties with St. Peter's successor and the Catholic Church; and Ethiopia is still separated from her.

But to what degree is Ethiopia divided from the Catholic Church? The dissent of the Ethiopian Church is due to external circumstances, i.e., to historical and geographical contingencies mentioned above, rather than to bona fide doctrinal differences. A critical analysis both of the Ethiopian liturgico-dogmatic documents and of the main reason for attacking Catholic doctrine (Ethiopians still believe that the Council of Chalcedon championed the cause of Nestorianism, and so they accuse the Catholics of positing two persons in Christ) shows us that only verbal misunderstandings keep the Ethiopians and the Catholic Church apart.

Misleading appearances, based primarily on the long dependence of the Ethiopian hierarchy on Alexandria, and the similarity of the two rites have led many to believe that the two churches, i.e., Ethiopian and

Coptic, are one in belief. But to-day one cannot say that this is the case, for the Ethiopian Church, since 1951, has become independent of the Coptic Church of Egypt. An Ethiopian metropolitan governs and directs the Ethiopian Church with all the rights and powers of jurisdiction. Until then, because of the pseudo-Nicene Canon, no Ethiopian Abuna (metropolitan) had ever been given such a position, with such power over the whole Ethiopian Church. And even the Egyptian Abuna, who always occupied that position, was never able to consecrate other bishops.

This new event in the religious history of Ethiopia has always been the dream of the Ethiopian Christians. More than once, in ages past, the Emperors of Ethiopia tried to realise it in various ways, but none succeeded.

Only the untiring interest and the cautious diplomacy of the present Emperor Haile Sillasie I have succeeded in realising it for the first time, thus freeing his Empire from an onerous religious subordination.

The present Ethiopian Abuna who governs the Church of Ethiopia is called Abuna Basilios. He and fourteen other bishops, equally Ethiopian, are dispersed in various parts of the Empire. Of these bishops, the last three (Abuna Lucas, entrusted with the region of the Arussians; Abuna Marcos with Goggiam; and Abuna Sawiros with Gomugherù) were consecrated in Addis-Ababà by the above-mentioned metropolitan on the 16th of May, 1952. This marked the second consecration of bishops on the part of Abuna Basilios.

Without doubt, the present state of the Ethiopian Church is much more favourable from the Catholic point of view than it was before, for the chief instigator of persecution against Catholics — the Egyptian Abuna — no longer enjoys jurisdiction in Ethiopia. The latter had always been at the head of a small nucleus of fanatical Monophysites (the Unctionists of Goggiam, or the Karrà) which for a long time constituted the chief obstacle to the spreading of the Catholic faith in Ethiopia. During the rule of the Egyptian Abunas, there was never unity of belief in Ethiopia. There was a small party of the Karrà Unctionists, called also Abunists, who were partisans of the Alexandrian Abuna. There was also the other party favouring the chief of Ethiopian monachism: the Ecceghiè which preferred to follow the doctrine of the Unionists, Zegga-lig or Sost-ledet, which differs from Catholic teaching only in name.

Now that there is, providentially, no Alexandrian Abuna, what will the future of his party be? It is certain that if this party also fails, which is desirable and to be hoped for, and if the Unionist party of the Debrelibanese establishes itself followed by the majority of the Ethiopians, the dissenting church of Ethiopia shall only have to conquer a few political and national prejudices to find herself once more in communion with the Catholic Church.

There are many reasons encouraging us to hope for the Ethiopian Church's reunion with Rome, and urging us to await it with particular

optimism. First of all, as we have already noted, their attachment to the See of Peter will be a contributing factor. In fact, both in theory and in practice, the Ethiopians have always shown signs of recognising the primacy of the See of Peter and of his successors, the Roman Pontiffs.

Another common heritage for both the Ethiopian dissenters and Catholics is their devotion to the Mother of God. This is one of the most efficacious means of obviating the activity of non-Catholic sects which contend with Catholic missionaries in the religious field in Ethiopia. The Blessed Virgin Mary, who is lowered even to the level of sinners like the rest of mankind by some Protestants, is, on the other hand, exalted by the Ethiopian dissenters and placed at the side of Christ. They acknowledge all the prerogatives, privileges, and doctrines concerning her. They are proud of being her inheritance, for they are convinced that Ethiopia was given in fief to Our Lady by the Redeemer — as an ancient legend narrates.

How could the Blessed Virgin not hasten to reclaim and lead back to the Fold of her Divine Son, this people which is so devoted to her, and which claims a tradition of love for her without parallel! She, who is the path to Jesus — "Ad Jesum per Mariam" — will not delay in leading Ethiopia to this goal.

P. MARIO DA ABIY-ADDI'
O.F.M. Cap.

"CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT"

Over twenty years ago the late Mr. John R. Mott spoke to me in Rome of "your Church's" refusal to take part in any ecumenical meetings. The refusal grieved him and puzzled him. Though he was a man of the most candid goodness of heart, of acute intelligence, and of wide and deep understanding, he remained upset and bewildered at our refusal. Yet in spite of that, he remained gentle, courtous, even respectful to one younger than himself, and remained firm in his conviction that Christ meant us all to be one. My meeting with him left upon me an indelible memory, for he seemed to me a man truly "meek and humble of heart."

I do not doubt that in the "Ecumenical Movement" there are many like Mr. Mott.

The purpose, however, of these reflections is not to try to explain our aloofness, but rather to set down some considerations which, in tendency at least, are hopeful.

The first is this: between Catholic and Protestant (the word "Protestant" is sometimes regarded as a less amiable term, but by it I mean to include all "our separated brethren" who belong neither to the Orthodox nor to the Roman Catholic communion) there is a very large measure of agreement upon the following:

1. The existence of God, and His providence over human affairs.

2. The revelations given to us by God in the Bible. Indeed it is in the field of Biblical scholarship that there is evidence of growing understanding.

3. The need of faith in God's revelations.

4. The Fall of man, and man's need for the grace of God; and especially the truth that in all the work of salvation God takes the initiative.

5. The divinity of Christ, His atonement, and His being the cause of all the grace which we receive.

6. The divinity of the Holy Spirit and His action in inspiring and guiding us.

7. The existence of at least two Sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, and the use among many non-Catholic bodies of ceremonies not unlike what Catholics call the other five Sacraments (1).

8. The immortality of the soul, human responsibility, and the judgment of God to come.

9. Last, but far from least, a conviction that present divisions of "the Church" is not according to God's Will and that we must strive, in a humble and penitent spirit, for unity.

Other matters might be added. No doubt there might be diverse

---

(1) Report of the Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order. London 1938, pp. 245-49.

emphasis laid on these doctrines, and quite different explanations given of things like the fall and original sin, and of faith. Nevertheless, in broad lines we agree as against atheist, agnostic, materialist, dualist and that general outlook which may be designated as "scientific humanism." There is agreement, too, that we should try, while admitting the truth and the good in non-Christian religions, to bring to the Christian faith Animists, Confucianists, Buddhists, Hundus, Jews, Mohammedans, Shintoists, and all those who do not profess belief in Christ as the final revealer of God.

In the practical field there are, too, large measures of agreement:

1. The "Christian ethic," vague as the term may be, covers a considerable radius of common outlook: acceptance of the Ten Commandments, and of the Sermon on the Mount.

2. As an outcrop from this: agreement upon the equality of men before God, and consequent agreement upon fundamentals touching "race relations," a subject of much consequence.

3. There is a common interest that peace should be preserved among nations and a common opposition to state domination.

4. In social policy there is very large measure of agreement, especially about protecting the holiness of marriage, and in raising the status of the under-privileged.

5. There is agreement, too, that religion should be propagated by reason, discussion, and persuasion.

6. Lastly, a point easy to overlook, there is a very wide measure of agreement that religion demands serious study and deep scholarship. In this latter field there is a general desire to make all knowledge commonly available, and even signs of a desire for some kind of a central body which should list and circularise all scholarly work, more especially in the field of Patristics and of the early history of Christianity.

7. The problems which face the ministry, and higher guiding or ruling bodies, are largely the same: the dangers of secularism, nationalism and religious indifference, etc.; and the efforts which must be made to utilize modern inventions like the cinema, radio, and television, in spreading and fostering religion.

In these "practical" points, also, the agreements listed cover considerable divergencies of outlook, method, and possibly of conviction. I remember once travelling in Italy with one of the heads of a non-Catholic body which was engaged in evangelization in Italy. After a long and amicable discussion of many points of doctrine, I remarked that really we were in agreement about very much; he answered, "Yes, but perhaps because we are agreed about so much we are therefore the further apart, even the more antagonistic." This surprised me, but on thinking it over I concluded that he may perhaps have meant that each believed the other made use of the truth they hold in order the better and more effectively to impose or maintain false and pernicious doctrines or practices.

Here perhaps the logical thing could be to list the matters which

divide us. I have in fact listed them, but as will appear from what follows, there seems small use in calling attention to them.

The following suggestions are possibly excessively obvious, and possibly may be regarded by some readers as impractical counsels of perfection; I make them, however, in all simplicity:

1. We must all realise that we are as human beings liable to pride — often not much a personal pride as that subtle pride which is liable to identify what we think is pure zeal for truth with the achievements and accomplishments of a particular group.

2. We must be patient and patient with one another. This does not mean mere slothful acquiescence in our divisions, but does mean that we can scarcely expect the divisions which are centuries old in growth to be composed either by some special effort, or by some special method, or to be composed rapidly. The cause of union is easily injured by too facile an optimism which easily has a flare-back when too sanguine hopes are frustrated.

3. We can always give one another credit for good will even when we most disagree. Controversy may possibly be sometimes needful, but the greatest care ought to be taken to avoid expressions or language which occasions ill feeling. This, of course, does not mean a failure to state, and state even forcibly, what we are sincerely convinced is the truth; but there are ways of doing this which, while maintaining full candour and force, still leave no wounds or scars. The aim should be, and should appear to be, that the truth may appear, and not that we may seem to have the upper hand.

4. As far as possible responsible persons of both allegiances ought to praise the work, especially the writings, of those who effectively oppose what is agreed to be deleterious, such as materialism, agnosticism, secularism. One hopeful sign most surely is the attitude of scholars in the biblical, patristic, missionological, and even ascetic fields.

5. It must be admitted that there is in fact a considerable amount of mutual dislike, even contempt, among some Catholics and some Protestants, due to all kinds of causes, different in different places, and different in degree and in expression. It is not worth while analysing this, for it seems enough to say that ill will and animosity is surely contrary to the spirit of Christ, even though it may disguise itself under the appearance — even to ourselves — of zeal for truth or indignation at the innocent being misled or imposed upon. Mere exhortations, however, are not enough to cure this mutual alienation; there must be more, if we may say so, of the "scientific" outlook, that is, greater care in examining evidence objectively, greater restraint in stating the findings from an examination of evidence. Every aspect of religion needs the service of our best brains and the application of the severest intellectual discipline, this aspect of the causes of mutual dislike not less than any other aspect. A general raising of the intellectual, cultural, and spiritual level of the clergy or ministry will help much to this, since learned and saintly men, spending themselves for Christ, are

less likely to harbour animosity, and the prejudices which are not seldom the off-spring of ignorance. It is too facile to say "tout comprendre, c'est tous pardonner"; nevertheless, understanding will surely lessen irritation and impatient annoyance. There are many signs that this is in fact happening; one of the most obvious is the number of books — some written by Catholics and some by Protestants — which may be found on the shelves of scholars, and the citations in books from Protestant or Catholic authors who make a contribution to the subject, though even here there is room for wider appreciation of the solid work being done in most, if not all, religious bodies.

6. Lastly, we must pray for one another with true Christ-like humility, but with Christ-like confidence. What man cannot do, God can do; and in this problem, as in all others, our reliance must be upon God.

BERNARD LEEMING, S. J.

ANGLICAN POSITIONS

The Church of England and Anglicanism

The modern world is full of paradoxes. In the Christian world there is no paradox more startling than the movement for unity among Protestants; for separatism was the charter of their origins, and fission was accounted by them at the time a courageous virtue. But little of that is true today; ecumenism is the prevailing interest now.

The Church of England, or Anglicanism (a comparatively modern term), is no less concerned with the urge to fellowship. To the magnetic field of Protestantism, Anglicanism feels a strong attraction in spite of certain small proclivities in the Catholic direction; and there is isolationism too: three aspects.

The Protestant pull is historic. For some three centuries the Church of England certainly regarded herself as an aristocratic cousin of Protestantism but refused to countenance total identification. There were differences. In the first place, the Church of England had the favor of the government; she was 'by law established', which meant that she had been drawn away from the Rock of Peter and set down on the gravel bed of the Crown. It was not a very reliable foundation, and it did not suit a large number of Englishmen. The Dissenters would have none of it, nor would the Recusants; but it made little difference. In the second place, theologically, the Church of England was originally somewhat ambiguous, satisfying her mind with the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion which were neither Lutheran nor Calvinist in a formal sense, only rather colored by Augsburg and Geneva. Then, on the other hand, the Church of England maintained certain rites and ordinances which appeared on the surface to have some similarity with the extinguished Catholic order of old, but so revamped as to be little more than vestiginal anomalies. These rites and ordinances have, however, served as points of departure for dispute, yet arguments hardly imagined in the beginning. Lastly, this Church 'by law established' was permitted by a fostering government to occupy and use certain of the old Catholic church properties for which the Crown had no immediate further use.

Such was the Church of England, intended and designed to stand with Protestantism while seeming at the same time not to have broken too far from the old Catholic forms. The Establishment was thus set up to be the inclusive Church for all the Queen's subjects, and thereto an appeal was made to nationalism. The soul of this Church was Protestant; its external features seemed to serve a cut-down Catholicism.

In the century of the Establishment, the Church of England was formed from the two old ecclesiastical provinces of Canterbury and York, and it was these two provinces which were maneuvered into forming the nationalistic schism from the Catholic Church centered for all

Western Christendom in the Roman Papacy. The first step was to declare the Pope to be a foreign potentate unjustly claiming rights over certain English affairs; and to substitute for him the legitimate authority, Parliament passed in 1534 the Act of Supremacy making the King Supreme Head of the Church in England. Then, later, as Protestantism prevailed over the old Catholic life, the Pope was represented as Anti-Christ himself. In the first instance, Sir Thomas More, Lord Chancellor to King Henry VIII, warned his master against schism, for thus he would be flying in the face of all ancient traditions, General Councils, the teaching of the Fathers, the unity of Christendom, and the company of all Catholic and Christian princes. But the king would have his way, and both he and his chancellor lost their heads in their separate fashions. In the latter instance, upon the accession of Queen Elizabeth I, 1558, Nicholas Heath, Archbishop of York and also chancellor, took the same line as More had done; but the Queen would not listen, for the alteration of religion was determined on because she 'liked it so', as the Spanish ambassador reported to King Philip II of Spain.

Such was the beginning of the Church of England. Time, however, has wrought changes; this national church, for all the political logic of its founding, is no longer national. She has become international, setting up her own institution in many lands far from England. In Europe, it is true, the Anglican chapels are chiefly for the use of the English living abroad or visiting overseas. In mission fields she is establishing native churches in communion with the Church at home. In the United States, Anglicanism is termed Protestant Episcopal. All this expansion abroad must be considered an anomaly when compared with the original claims to justify the national independence of the Church of England.

And yet, as an independent denomination, Anglicanism is, paradoxically, consorting with ecumenism, maintaining certain reservations, however, so as not to be engulfed in pan-Protestantism, or, on the other hand, draw too close to Rome. For this purpose she announces that she is the 'bridge church', which means that she considers herself ideally situated for any eventual reconciliation between separated Christian groups.

While one end of the 'bridge' is rapidly approaching the Protestant Shore, a plank or two are directed towards Catholic Ground. These 'planks' represent the pronouncement of the Anglican Episcopate in one of their Lambeth Conferences that any reunion of Christendom apart from 'the great Latin Church of the West' is not to be thought of.

But Anglicanism is not really monolithic; it is two, three, or more things in a comprehensiveness that fairly staggers the mind. First, there is the great body of the Anglican faithful who are more or less contented with the mild ritualism of the Prayer Book and with few if any questions asked about doctrine. Then, there are the Modernists,

a vocal group, mostly scholars concerning themselves with reinterpreting the faith, that is rationalizing religion. If they were to have their way, revelation and the supernatural would recede into myth. There are also the planners of unity schemes, doubtless sincere in intention, who advocate full participation in ecumenism. This latter group has recently gained two signal successes, namely, participation in the Evanston Conference, 1954, and, more immediate and important, the recognition of the Church of South India 1955, thereby compromising any claim to valid Orders on which point the Anglo-Catholics take their stand. Lastly, there are the Anglo-Catholics who range from academic High Churchmen to advanced Roman ritualists and sacramentarians. They will have none of Protestantism but show a decided preference for Catholicism.

Anglo-Catholics express their diffidence over Evanston and give way to alarm concerning the recognition of the Church of South India, but are prone to hold their ground in any case. They have on their extreme right a sort of splinter party, the pro-papalists. This small coterie, despite their convictions, will have little or no success with Anglicanism. What the results of their efforts may be they will have to settle individually for themselves, as from time to time some of them do and have lately done in the crisis over South India, carrying their logic to its conclusion by submitting to the authority they claim to recognize, namely, the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic See of Peter.

The Ancient British Church *

For all their orientation towards Catholicism, some Anglo-Catholics pursue an independent philosophy; it is no union at all, either with Dissenters or with Roman Catholicism. They proclaim themselves Anglo-Catholics, with special emphasis on the Anglo, and not Roman Catholics. It is a sort of isolationist position and a throwback to nationalism. Here is an unbridgeable crevasse. For support an appeal is made to the past, by-passing for the moment the 16th century and the Establisment. The thesis goes something like this:

Christianity (they claim) came to Britain very early in a non-papal fashion; and an independent British Church was set up, owing nothing to the Papacy. The Church of England is the true and legitimate heir of this original Church. For did not St. Augustine. when he was sent to Britain (then become England) by Pope St. Gregory at the end of the 6th century, find there a Church already in existence? Was he not, then, intruding with a foreign mission on native preserves? Should he not have attached himself to the Church-in-being? Unfortunately, he did nothing of the sort but arrogantly treated with

---

(*) For full discussion see *The Celtic Church and the See of Peter* by J. C. MacNaught: Blackwell, Oxford, 1923.

the British bishops. And later, the Roman mission forced the native Church into submission to the Pope, a servitude which lasted till the 16th century when by the Reformation liberty and autonomy were restored. This freedom Anglo-Catholics, for the Church of England, ought to strive to preserve.

Evidently, the first question that arises is: how could Christianity have reached Britain in the early centuries unless it came by way of the Roman Empire? Britain was a Roman province, fully established and integrated in the life of the Empire. But this fact is summarily set aside. Britain was, according to the above view, evangelized by Greeks, but this is a thin reply. The Greeks, if any, for the bare assertion is debatable, were undoubtedly Romans in the political sense; for Greece was a territory within the Empire. Christian Greeks were also members of the One Church throughout the Empire, from Asia to the Atlantic. There the implication seems to be that the Eastern and Western parts of the Church were at that time in schism, but they were not; it would be historically erroneous to suppose that they were.

An appeal can be made to archeology to prove the common character of living in the Empire, especially in Gaul and Britain. Modern work in this science has revealed many remains of the Roman way of life in Britain before the coming of the Anglo-Saxons. And many of these disclose clear evidence that Christianity flourished in Britain in the days of the Roman power and was Roman in character. There are church-sites and foundations. There are the witnesses of chapels in private villas, such as the one uncovered at Lullingstone in Kent. There are mural paintings similar to those found in the Roman catacombs and most ancient churches. Such similarity points to one inescapable conclusion: that the Church throughout the Empire was one. One could cite from the writings of several of the earliest Popes the established faith in the oneness of the Church. (1) Further, the protomartyr of Britain, St. Alban, was a Roman officer, whatever his race. His martyrdom took place around 285 at Verulam, now known as St. Albans in his honor. St. Alban would not be included among the saints of the Catholic Church had he belonged to some separated sect in Britain.

Constantine, the emperor who inlawed Christianity in the Empire and was himself baptized at the end of his life, was proclaimed Augustus at York. Most of his soldiers must have been Christians; otherwise he would not have dared raise the Laburnam above the Eagles in his march on Rome. Helena, Constantine's mother, was a devout Christian lady who often resided at Colchester in the county that is now Essex. It would be most unreasonable to suppose that she wor-

---

(1) Cf. *Documents of the Christian Church,* selected and edited by Henry Bettenson: London, Oxford University Press, 1947, pp. 131-34.

shiped in a "foreign" chapel in Britain because the British Church was not in communion with Rome.

Anglicans make much of the fact that there were British bishops at the Council of Arles in 319. But if this is so, it merely proves that they were Catholic prelates at a Catholic council, a council, moreover, assembled to deal with the sectarian Donatists. There is no evidence that these British bishops were Donatists to be expelled by the Catholics from the communion of the Church.

Then, there was St. Patrick, a young Roman British aristocrat, who carried the Cross to Ireland. (This will be dealt with subsequently.)

These few citations certainly argue a Roman origin and a common Catholic life for the Church in Britain in the days before Britain was lost to the Empire.

A further claim made by some Anglicans is that prior to the alleged encroachments of Rome, Christianity was free and national in every country quite after the pattern of Anglican institutions today. For, they assert, when St. Augustine's Roman mission sought union through the submission of the Church which he found in Britain, that Church refused and resisted his arbitrary demands, preferring their own customs and way of life to all foreign importations.

There are two answers we can make to this argument. One is that for something more than a century the Church in Britain had been constrained to carry on with only the most casual contacts with the Continent and that consideration and delay were only to be expected before reunion could be achieved again. The other argument is (and it further substantiates the evidence of the Roman character of the British Church) that the special customs jealously guarded by the British Church were just the matters in dispute throughout the Catholic world when British Christianity was compelled to move into the West and Ireland before the onrush of the barbarous and pagan Anglo-Saxons. So, during the years of enforced isolation, the British Church held fast to what had been hers because she was unable to keep up with what was going on and being settled in the rest of the Church abroad.

* * *

Another tenet to be found among some Anglo-Catholics is that the Pope, in the course of time, arrogated to himself prerogatives unknown and unacknowledged in earlier centuries. The history of the Papacy, however, is quite otherwise; it is enough to say that the prerogatives of the Holy See were inherent in the Papacy from the beginning and that the Pope did not hesitate to exercise them whenever some crisis demanded that he should do so. (2)

---

(2) For fuller discussion see *Some Notes on the Petrine Claims,* von Hugel.

One or two examples from the earlier period of the Church should suffice.

Pope Sylvestre I, the reigning pontiff when the First General Council was held at Nicea in 325, acting through his legate, Hosius of Cordova, whom he sent to affirm the Catholic Faith against Arianism and all who were ready to compromise, tore up the Semi-Arian Formula. It was a bold thing to do, for both the Emperor Constantine, to whom the Church truly owed so much, and a great number of bishops favored recognizing Arianism, or at least for the sake of peace some compromised version of it. Only Hosius with the papal mandate would have none of it. The results? The Nicene Creed and the faith of the Church down the succeeding centuries. Can it be that the Church in Britain, more than a century before her isolation, did not accept and share that decision, and that simply because she was in communion with the Holy See and recognized the authority of Pope Sylvestre?

Again (to cite another case), St. Leo the Great served his famous Tome on the Council of Chalcedon, 451, thus putting the teaching of the Church against the 5th century heresy, Monophysitism, firmly on record. All the Fathers of the Council acquiesced and cried out "Peter has spoken through the mouth of Leo!"

There is yet other evidence of British unity within the Church tied to the Papacy, but it is negative in character and merely proves the point of intercommunion. Just before the Roman protection of Britain was necessarily withdrawn, there arose in Britain itself the Pelagian heresy of which the whole Church took note and condemned. Had the British Church been uniquely autonomous, Pelagianism would have been confined to its own circumference and not spread to the mainland. St. Germanus of Auxerre visited Britain as late as 447 for the express purpose of combatting the spread of Pelagius's false doctrines of grace; this was the last visit of a continental prelate, as far as we know, until the arrival of St. Augustine in 597, a hundred and fifty years later. (3)

The Dark Ages

When the Roman legions were withdrawn from Britain for the defense of the Continental provinces against Visi-Goth and Hun, contrary to intention and because of the force of circumstances never to return, Britain was left defenseless. The Province in time fell prey to barbarian pirates and invaders from all quarters. An iron curtain descended, cutting Britain off from the very sources of her cultural and religious life. The Church, thus isolated, fought a retiring action, until forced into the Welsh mountains or springing up in her new planting in Ireland. In the circumstances, some Roman Britons, those

---

(3) See documents relating to Pelagianism in *Documents of the Christian Church:* Bettenson, Sec. VI.

who could, escaped before the barbarian invaders to Armorica and Gaul where they were absorbed among people and co-religionists of their own kind. Some, on the other hand, fled to Ireland.

Of the latter, one such refugee went most unwillingly: he was enslaved and transported to that pagan land. This was Patrick, founder of the Irish Church. After some years of servitude, he was released and at once sought training that he might return to the land of his slavery as a Christian apostle to convert those wild pagans. Consequently, he received his education at the monastic school of Lerins, an island off the southern coast of Gaul and a fertile producer of missionaries. St. Patrick was trained at Lerins for the simple reason that he was in communion with the Catholic Church of all the West in which Britain, as he had known it in his extreme youth, was a part.

Generally speaking, the British Catholics who took refuge in Ireland found themselves among uncivilized and pagan people. To protect themselves and their way of life and religion, they built stockades in which to reside, as the Culdees did when they went to a strange and savage trans-Atlantic land. In time the stockades became religious centers and monasteries from which radiated throughout Ireland the influence of the Catholic Faith. And still later, so filled with zeal for the Faith as not to be confined, the Irish missionaries rushed forth to plant their religion amongst their kin in Scotland and Northumbria, and, indeed, to the uttermost fringes of Europe.

Certainly, the Irish evangelists did not impinge on the Church elsewhere a rival or parallel organization as representatives of a separate and autonomous Church; rather they integrated their work with the organization of the Church wherever they found it to be. It would be beside the point to contend that the Irish missions proved their independence and separateness from Rome on the grounds that the unit of their work was the monastery and not the Continental diocese which was the Roman norm. Until integration took place, it was only natural that the Irish should work from the units already familiar to them at home. Ireland had never been in the territories of the Roman Empire, nor been civilly marked out in provinces and dioceses as the Empire was and to which civil structure the Church had adapted Her own organization. The Irish missions totally abandoned their own operational organization as soon as they merged into the general and universal life of the Church.

Further, it is not without apologetic value to note that the Church in Ireland, heir as it was of the British Church, received no tradition of autonomy nor ever thought seriously of a 'national church' like the Church of England. Though considering the circumstances of the origins of the Church in Ireland, it had a better claim to autonomy than Britain, being founded outside the territories of the Empire and as near *sui generis* as can be imagined. But the Church in Ireland never claimed to be other than a part of the Catholic Church in full

communion with Rome, nor did Ireland ever waver in loyalty to the Holy See. Against all possible pressures she remained staunchly submissive to the Holy See. In the 16th century, had the Irish separated from that allegiance, as did the ecclesiastical organization in England, British policies in the smaller island would have been a deal easier than they were.

In that dark interim of about a century and a half of which so little is known, when civilized, Christian Britain was isolated to all intents and purposes, there were, nevertheless, pin-points of light through the iron curtain.

One typical case is that of St. Gildas, surnamed the Wise, perhaps a native of Wales, who lived in the very midst of the closed period. Yet it is recorded that he left Britain somehow and spent several years studying in the monasteries and schools on the Continent, after the fashion of St. Patrick. And again, like St. Patrick, he visited Ireland. In Pembrokeshire he set up a church and school. In the end, conditions in Britain must rather have got the better of him, for he emigrated to Armorica, or Brittany, and there founded the monastery of St. Gildas de Ruys. This, likewise, followed the pattern of those British refugees who sought asylum on the Continent. St. Gildas's extant work, *De excidio Britanniae (Concerning The Fall of Britain)* must have come right from his heart.

Another case, already mentioned, is the visit to Britain of St. Germanus of Auxerre, just before the great darkness closed in.

Perhaps the marriage of Bertha, the Frankish princess, daughter of Caribert, Prince of Paris, and a Catholic, to the pagan King of Kent, is another proof of contact. Ethelbert's emissaries must have gone peacefully to Frankland and brought back information of the more civilized Catholic culture there. And Bertha was allowed to go to Kent in England with full safeguards for the practice of her religion. It was through this marriage that St. Augustine obtained permission to land in Kent.

The Church of the English

The mission of St. Augustine was sent to Britain, which had now become England in the hundred and fifty years since its loss to the Roman Empire (itself now non-existent), for the express purpose of bringing the new people of that land into the Fold of the Catholic Church and to seek for any remains of the old Church which might still exist in what had been so fair a Roman province. This was the intention of its sponsor, Pope St. Gregory the Great (590-604).

The new peoples of Britain were not Britons; they were Anglo-Saxons. It can be presumed that the older and original population whom the Anglo-Saxons conquered had not been exterminated or all forced into flight. A large percentage must have remained to be ruled over by the incoming marauders. Many may have carried on a per-

sonal or family tradition of the Faith, but the organic institution of the Church had succumbed and disappeared before the wave of paganism sweeping in from Frisia and the Low Countries. The Church survived in weakened form only in the far west. There is little to lead one to believe that the people whom the Anglo-Saxons overran made any active or organized attempt to evangelize their masters.

At length, in 596 or 597, came St. Augustine and his monks from Rome to re-establish Christianity and civilization in the lost province, like a rope thrown out to a small boat adrift to tow it back to the mother-ship. Such was the Roman mission which fixed its seat of operation at Canterbury in the County of Kent. From thence the work of conversion began. For a time the old Church locked in Wales, and her Irish daughter sweeping successfully through Northumbria, held aloof; but at length the northern and southern forces joined to form the Church in England. The merger was due to the vigorous influence of the Saxon clergy belonging to the northern mission, such personages as St. Wilfrid of York, Benedict Biscop, and St. Willibrod. Their monastic centers like Whitby, Wearmouth, and Jarrow adopted the Roman customs and usages until the whole Roman system of organization prevailed; dioceses were formed; Roman canon law was introduced; and the Church in England was one as well as at one with the whole Catholic Church of the West.

This was not the enslavement of the ancient British Church but a new being, the Church of the English, drawing its vitality from the mainspring of Catholic life, the Papacy. It was Catholic; it was Roman. It would be begging the question to maintain otherwise, for what remained of the old Church was absorbed as a minority into the larger organization.

And so the work went on, even to the conversion of the Danes who flooded into both England and Ireland in the 9th and 10th centuries. After 1016, when the Danes had put down all Saxon resistence, the wise policy of King Knute merged the two ethnic groups, and the Danish adoption of the Catholic Religion was the means of blending them. King Knute visited Rome, as the Saxon Alfred had done, for both recognized in Rome the fountain-head of religion and culture.

Together, Saxon and Dane, with whatever elements of the aboriginal British population that was left, formed the early English people. Then, after 1066, came the Norman French, and about a century later the Norman-Angevins and Aquitanians. The modern English race is made up of these elements: the British factor was so much in the minority and indeed so absorbed as to be non-existent. And the Church of these people was Catholic and Roman, not at all an enslaved older Church. For nigh on five centuries following, no Englishman ever supposed that his Church was anything but Roman, Papal, Catholic. Indeed, it might be said, in the span of time from the coming of St. Augustine in 597 to the Act of Supremacy in 1534, more if the

time is pushed forward to the date of the Elizabethan Establishment in 1559, England and the English people were part and parcel of Christendom in the oneness of the Roman and Catholic Church and religion.

A few instances will illustrate this situation. The Holy See dispatched prelates from remote parts of the Catholic world to serve and rule the English Church, the most notable being St. Theodore of Tarsus. The names of distinguished Archbishops of Canterbury come to mind: St. Anselm, Lanfranc, to say nothing of England's great martyr, St. Thomas of Canterbury, son of a Norman-French family domiciled in England, he who gave his life in the cause of Catholic unity and the freedom of the Church from the rapacity of King Henry II. Likewise, English clergy served in the Church abroad. Two were early in this class; St. Willibrod (b. 658) became Bishop of Utrecht in the Low Countries, and St. Boniface (b. 680), whose English name was Winfrid, was missionary to the Germans and martyred by the Frisians. He was chief advisor to King Pepin-the-Short of Frankland; and his emissary to the Holy See, Nicholas Breakspear, became Pope Hadrian IV in 1154.

Thus it can be seen that England occupied a prominent place in the unity of the Catholic World, that universal fraternity which made Christendom one. For Europe, after the fall of the civil dominion of Rome, never again achieved political unity; her unity was realized in religion: one Church, one Faith, one Law, one realm of scholarship and learning, and the one code of courtesy, chivalry, which developed as a result of the immense effort of crusading. In architecture and all the forms of art, even in liturgy, there was oneness. It might be objected here that there were local liturgical rites and usages. This is true, but the norm was the same and the minor variations of little significance; certainly not as expressions of disagreement with the Holy See or in opposition to the majestic Roman Rite. For all bore united witness to the belief in Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Altar. The English sees had their minor variations just as many of the Continental dioceses had. (Standardization, with a few minor exceptions allowed, was to come after the Council of Trent, 1563-4.) Moreover, in all the reforms of the Middle Ages, Cluniac, Cistercian, Mendicant, England shared. Alas, England suffered too from those times of spiritual and ecclesiastical sickness which from time to time caused cancerous sores on the Body of the Church, and eventually it was King Henry VIII who was to sever the bond which bound the Church in England to the center of Catholic unity.

T. BOWYER CAMPBELL

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

A GERMAN BISHOP DISCUSSES CHRISTIAN UNITY

Over the years the Chair of Unity Octave in January has been the occasion of pastoral exhortations on the part of Catholic bishops to their faithful in order to awaken within them the desire to work and pray for that unity which Our Lord willed for those who believe in Him. One of these appeals from the pen of His Excellency, Dr. Julius Döpfner, Bishop of Würzburg, appeared in the Deutsche Tagespost *of January 27. In it the Bishop treats of the problem of disunion under various aspects, stressing in particular the attitude Catholics should exhibit towards those not of their faith, and suggesting the possibility of inter-confessional collaboration in those spheres in which common interests are at stake. A translation of Bishop Döpfner's article follows:*

In recent years it has been objected to on the part of German Evangelical leaders that the Catholic Church is conducting an ably disguised but minutely planned Counterreformation. If, for example, it becomes necessary to erect a Catholic church for refugees in northern Germany, this undertaking, in a given case, is looked upon as disturbing confessional tranquillity, even when the size of the pastoral area and the number of the faithful make such a step absolutely indispensable.

With reference to the aims of our world-wide Octave of Prayer, we hear, for instance, objections like this: How can an ecumenical dialogue or a religious effort for the unity of Christians be possible if the Catholic Church, and consequently her members, have no other intention, a priori, than that of drawing others over to their side? Among Catholics one can find a different way of reasoning about the matter, but this does not differ to any real extent from the preceding when one considers the consequences.

Is it really necessary, so many ask, that the Catholic Church should concern herself about the return of separated Christians and that dissidents should reunite with her? The doctrine on the Church as the only way of salvation, as we know, comprises also the reassuring truth that even one who is outside the Church can be saved through her mediation if he is in good faith. So why not let each one remain on the road on which he finds himself and follow it faithfully? In this way peace will be assured without aggravating the relations between the Christian confessions.

Let us make this question the object of our meditation during this universal Octave of Prayer.

Every religion, indeed every spiritual movement, which possesses in itself a certain vitality, tends to diffuse itself. Even liberalism, which as part of its platform subscribes to personal liberty and ideological

tolerance as a decisive point, possesses a quasi missionary character and at times shows itself capable of being candidly intolerant in matters of culture. In like manner Protestantism openly aims at evangelization in Catholic countries. I could point to many examples within the limits of my diocese of evangelical ministers who work very energetically to win Catholics over to their confession. Evangelical synods, further, in their annual reports refer to the same sense of missionary duty and of the respective results attained.

Let it not be said that such endeavours are simply a measure of defense with which it is necessary to confront the expansive tendency of Catholicism, for even in countries and regions which are overwhelmingly Catholic one can find a well-organized Protestant evangelization. It is not our intention for the present to judge of the value of this activity but only to call attention to the fact itself.

As long as the Church in her earthly pilgrimage has not yet embraced the whole of humanity, she can allow herself no rest. All the painful divisions which have been realized over the course of the Church's history have created for her the pressing duty of reconciling her separated children. Even St. Paul never ceased to struggle for the salvation of the Hebrew nation and for each of his countrymen despite all the failures he experienced in his missionary work among the Jews, a presage of a formidable mystery of divine predestination.

The Church, as the *signum levatum in nationibus*, must in its responsibility for the whole human race actualize all her forces so that eventually there may be but "one fold and one Shepherd" (John, X, 16). She would be betraying her special mission if she were to be content with her present confines.

Every non-Catholic, meanwhile, who becomes aware that the Catholic Church is the true Church, is obligate before God to follow the consequences of that awareness and to become a member of it. He has received an invitation of grace which he cannot decline without compromising his salvation. Besides, by his refusal he would be depriving the Church of Christ of his personal contribution towards the fullness of its witness before the world. I would like to emphasize the importance of this obligation because in our day it not infrequently happens that non-Catholics are convinced of the truth of the Catholic faith, or else are very close to this conviction; but unfortunately they stop at the very threshold of the Church. They avoid making the decision to enter, or otherwise they believe, perhaps in all sincerity, that they have a mission to accomplish outside the Church. Apropos of this, we must not forget that there may be reasonable motives for postponing one's entrance into the Church — at least for a time.

But do converts really derive some advantage by their coming into the Church and thereby participating henceforth in the grace of Christ? Most certainly. Their advantage is incalculably great. In spite of all the human frailties that one may encounter in the Church

— and it is well that the convert should take this into account — still he will realize that there is nothing worthwhile that he must sacrifice; instead he will be receiving the fullness of grace. His own actual and limited participation will grow in the rich abundance of the House of God. Now he finds himself on the solid ground of the Catholic Church which is constantly renewed in Christ through the fulness of His power and the mediation of her apostolic succession — and this with a greater vigor than any other Christian community.

The Catholic should meet his separated brethren with a comprehensive charity inspired by the Spirit of Christ. He should see in the non-Catholic not the heretic or the apostate but a brother whom Christ Himself is earnestly seeking. Our separated brethren must feel that we take their point of view seriously and that we do not regard them with the attitude of *beati possidentes* or with an air of superiority.

Nevertheless, when it happens that the Catholic Church, its teaching, or the Catholic way of life are misunderstood or criticized, we do not wish to gloss over the fact that this can proceed from ill will. Yet it may also be due to an insufficient knowledge. In forming our judgment, we wish to be perfectly fair not only towards individual non-Catholics but also towards dissenting communities. We must, of course, take account of the errors which have arisen from the separation from Mother Church; but we must not forget that these communities, according to the divine plan, do share in the task of the Church by means of the sacred inheritance which they have brought with them. Consequently, we cannot but rejoice sincerely if the Evangelical Church with an anxious and efficacious care for souls brings its members to Christ; and we consider it unjust to impede such activity. For by doing so the way would be opened to atheism and to a decadence of the Christian life.

The only motivation which is perfectly valid for entrance into the Catholic Church is the divine call to the true Church of Christ. Accordingly, one must reject all other motives which comprise external advantages, consideration of family ties, or agreement between confessions for more impressive religious statistics; converts are "not to be numbered, but to be weighed." More than one of the latter must have wondered at the reserve of the priest when they requested admission into the Church and were required to undergo a thorough course of instruction. I must at this point express my apprehension, which is grounded on experience within my own diocese, that there are persons who become Catholics through motives and ways which are open to question. In any case, I admonish my confreres to make a diligent examination of the intentions of future converts and to dispose them for a sincere act of faith through the medium of an ample and thorough instruction.

Finally, is there any possibility of collaboration between Catholics and their separated brethren on the missionary level? With a correct

distinction between one's own religious mission and the actualization of a common endeavour, this may take place, as experience is showing us, notwithstanding the existence of a good amount of disagreeable tension. What, furthermore, are the prospects of an agreement between Christians similar to that which is often the case in other sectors of life? Political groups which vie with all their forces during the electoral campaign for the support of the voters — and this can be done with all due respect — can later, in view of a common responsibility for the nation, unite effectively in mutual collaboration. This can be seen in the case of committees or a governmental coalition, even though we know quite well that in the subsequent elections they will once again be vying with one another.

In a similar way, the Catholic who is convinced of the truth of his Church and desires to propagate its message will extend his hand to the Evangelical Christian in a common Christian responsibility for cultural and political progress and in a mutual defense against the forces of atheism.

To be sure, there is to be no question of prestige or of confessional competition in such matters. Nevertheless, one must not overlook the danger of a saccharine kind of tolerance and of a vague Christianity without the Church. Here a necessary presupposition is the clear distinction between a comprehensive collaboration and religious conviction. A pan-Christian indifferentism would not help any of the Christian communities. Where the force of the faith and of its profession is weakened, there the enbankments give way to atheism. Since it is not possible to free ourselves immediately from the weight of Christian division, we must render it more tolerable in the spirit of charity and in view of the responsibility we share for all of Christendom and still more for all humanity.

"It seems to me," Cardinal Newman used to say, "that the first step towards any hope for unity in the midst of our divisions is for each religious man to live according to the Gospel."

* * *

GERMAN PROTESTANTS AND THE PAPACY

On the 23rd January, Dr. Otto Dibelius, the Lutheran Bishop of Berlin and president of the Council of Evangelical Churches of Germany, was received in audience by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in the course of a trip the Bishop was making to Australia where the World Council of Churches (of which Dr. Dibelius is a co-president) was to sponsor an important meeting.

The news of the audience caused a certain flurry in the Protestant circles of Germany. Apparently, no one had expected such an occurrence. Pastor Niemoeller, director of the Office of External Affairs of the Evangelical Churches of Germany, refused to believe it. Newspapers

spoke of a "matter of protocol," of a "visit of simple courtesy" which was understandable in the light of the situation of both Catholics and Protestants in East Germany. One paper even said that Dr. Dibelius simply wished to have his son, who was accompanying him, meet Pope Pius!

An effort was made to avoid the term "Pope"; instead, the periodicals referred to the visit as having been made to "the Bishop of Rome" or spoke of a meeting with "the Head of the Roman Catholic Church."

In East Germany, however, the press inveighed against Dr. Dibelius. A minister of Schwerin, known for his sympathies towards communism, wrote in the *Berliner Zeitung* that the Bishop of Berlin had gone to "receive orders from the Pope," a thing that would have been unthinkable in the time of Luther.

From another side, the organ of the Christian party in the East Zone, *Neue Zeit*, spoke of strange tendencies towards a liaison between the theology and religion of Catholics and Protestants.

But still another voice made itself heard, this time that of Pastor Hans Asmussen. In an editorial in the Christian newspaper, *Koelnische Rundschau,* which enjoys a circulation of more than a million, he wrote that "since the separation of four hundred years ago, no event can be even remotely compared with this visit." It cannot at all be put on the same level with the recent visit of German Protestant leaders to Moscow; such visits are the current fashion, while in Rome Dr. Dibelius went against the public opinion of his church.

But it is precisely in this way, continues Pastor Asmussen, that the way is paved for great things. Bishop Dibelius swam, as it were, against the current; but often currents change their direction when powerful swimmers decide to go counter to them. It matters little, he adds, what was discussed during the course of the visit. Even admitting that the Lutheran leader had simply shaken hands with the Pope and inquired about his health, the gesture would still retain all its importance; for it would mean: "We have no right to be enemies: we can no longer act as if we were living in 1555."

* * *

Upon his return from Australia, Dr. Dibelius accorded an interview to the German television network on March 4 which, in fact, vindicated the view taken by Pastor Asmussen. "I went to Rome," he declared, "to visit the German community and to preach there. An audience with the Pope was suggested to me, and I felt that I should not refuse it. It is, after all, a very good thing for the world to see that Christians, as Christians, can clasp hands over and above the very great differences and the great tensions that exist between their Churches because in their souls burns the desire to bring back our dispersed humanity to an internal and external peace."

Certainly, this gesture is one of weighty consequence, since it signifies that Protestants no longer look upon the Pope as the Antichrist as Luther did.

In this connection, the Lutheran Bishop of Hanover, Dr. Hans Lilje, while paying respect to His Holiness, Pope Pius, also took occasion to delineate the distance of German Protestantism from the papacy. Just recently Bishop Lilje dedicated an article to the Holy Father in the March 11th issue of the Protestant journal *Sonntagsblatt* (published in Hamburg) having for its title: "A Roman of the Romans." In this article he recalls that on the day of the papal election the people of Rome who were massed in St. Peter's Square received with great enthusiasm the news that the new pope was a Roman — the first in almost two centuries — and cried: "Un Romano di Roma!" — "a Roman of Rome!"

This cry of the Roman people, observes Dr. Lilje, had a much deeper significance: Pius XII merits the title "Great" because everything in his personality expresses the essence of Roman Catholicism which is in some sort embodied in him. One must reckon him on the same level with Leo I, Gregory the Great, Nicholas I, Gregory VII, Innocent III, and Pius IX, all of whom developed and reinforced the primacy of Rome, the juridical and institutional character of the Catholic Church, and by way of consequence, the magnificence of the visible Church on earth.

"The significance of this for us Protestants," continues the Bishop, "is that, over and beyond the high regard that is felt in the presence of the personality of the Pope, imbued with spirituality, and refined by asceticism, we perceive in him at the same time that which is different, that which separates us. Without a studied opposition to Protestantism, but as the natural expression of his personal position, Pius XII has insisted precisely on those very elements of Catholic doctrine and practice which appear to us as typically Catholic."

As examples of this, Dr. Lilje cites the infallible *magisterium* of the Church, the return to the thought of St. Thomas, and especially Marian devotion. "But with all that," he avers finally, "he justly reveals himself as a real 'Roman of Rome' and consequently as a great pope."

Underlying this encomium, which is doubtless sincere, we can perceive the reasoning of Bishop Lilje: the "Roman" Church, although recognized as an authentically Christian Church, is nevertheless gainsaid in its claim to "Catholicity," to universality. This negative aspect, however, should not make us forget that this article adds an official confirmation to the gesture of Dr. Dibelius and sustains the abandonment of Lutheran anti-papal prejudice. Another swimmer has come to the side of the Lutheran Bishop of Berlin.

La Croix

THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN RUSSIA - A STATEMENT BY AMERICAN CHURCH LEADERS

World-wide interest was awakened recently by the visit of a group of American churchmen to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Patriarch of Moscow. The deputation, made up of nine members, was commissioned by the National Council of Churches in the U.S.A., the president of which is Dr. Eugene Carson Blake. He was accompanied to Russia by the following clergymen: Paul B. Anderson, Roswell P. Barnes, Franklin Clark Fry, Herbert Gezork, D. Ward Nichols, Charles Coolidge Parlin, Henry Knox Sherrill and Walter W. Van Kirk. Upon their return to New York on March 23, the members of the group released the following statement to the press:

Our mission was to church leaders in Russia. We knew in advance of our going that it would not be easy to achieve understanding, let alone agreement. But we believed that in a time of world tension, with deep cleavage between East and West, Christians of varying backgrounds and traditions should talk with one another with frankness in an endeavour to clarify differences and to seek areas of agreement. This we did.

The experience was profitable. We understand the Russian churchmen better as a result of our conversations. We are also confident that our clear statements face to face enabled them to understand us better.

This visit should be understood as a first step toward future correspondence and other exchanges. Thus limited in objective, our mission has been accomplished, and we regard it a distinct success.

We were received with generous hospitality. We had formal conferences as well as countless personal conversations, since we were constantly in the presence of Russian Christians. We visited many churches and shared in the worship of the Orthodox as well as the Baptists. Lutherans from the Baltic states and Armenian Orthodox joined in the discussions. We were taken to theological seminaries and academies and to monasteries.

In addition we held two conferences with the Councils of the Soviet Government which deal with religious affairs. As we went for a definite church purpose, we make no comments on economic and political conditions in the Soviet Union except as they directly apply to the situation of the churches.

It is apparent that Church and State have reached at least a temporary accommodation.

It was stated again and again that Church and State are separate. In a limited sense this is true, by our standards. There seems to be no interference with worship in the church. Congregations were large and devout in the relatively few available churches with a preponderance of older people and of women. Enrollment in the few theological

seminaries that are open is at capacity. Some churches have been repaired and a few new ones are being built, though there are far from enough.

The most severe limitation of the church is in the area of education; for there seems to be no religious education except in the home by parents and by priests or ministers on occasional visitations. Publication of literature is confined almost entirely to books used in worship. It is clear that the churches generally are confined within themselves. They regard their function as that of saving souls and preparing them for Heaven. They show little other concern for the social or intellectual life of their people. It was the prevailing assumption that science involves the reason, religion the feelings. Educational, economic, and political life is the concern of the state. Worship, from birth to death, is the task of the church.

This sharp division of function, in a population rapidly receiving scientific education biased toward atheistic assumptions, constitutes perhaps a greater danger to the church than does political control of the church itself.

This generally prevailing concept of the mission of the church is in our judgment inadequate. It has not always been so narrowly conceived by the church as now in the Soviet Union. There is obviously a fundamental difference between the concept of the mission of the church as we found it in the Soviet Union today and that which we hold in our churches. We hope that future conversations will bring both to them and to us a deeper understanding of the church's mission. On our side, we are already grateful for a deepened appreciation of the elements of devotion and mystery in Christianity. We hope that further contacts will lead them to increased concern for the totality of life.

During the last several years the policy of the Soviet Government has discouraged persecution of the churches and has regarded the clergy and other believers as loyal citizens. At the same time it has increased the aggressiveness of scientific education as the means ultimately to eradicate religion. Thus the church has more freedom than in preceding decades but at the same time confronts a more subtle challenge. It is our hope that, even within the limitations imposed by the state, the church will find effective answers and effective means for teaching to the end that the Christian faith may be maintained and strengthened.

In return for freedom of worship the leaders of the churches have apparently inclined to go along with Soviet communist leadership in important areas. Perhaps the most distressing illustration is in the area of peace propaganda.

We had frank discussions of that matter. We are convinced that the Russian churches and people ardently desire peace. However, the statements of the church leaders were almost uniformly identical in

making vague appeals for "the defence of peace" without taking into consideration the realities of the world situation or the facts of history. It appeared to us that their concept of peace was derived not only from the Soviet Foreign Office but also from an inadequate concept of the mission of the church.

We pointed out that the World Peace Council, in which church leaders from Russia have given conspicuous leadership, has consistently taken the same line as that of the Soviet Government and that participants from the West have not been truly representative of Western churches. We emphasised the necessity of finding some other basis than their past positions if we are to work together for peace.

We made it clear that the means to peace are as important as the end. Specifically, we set forth certain positions taken by the National Council of Churches, for example: (1) Peace cannot be achieved apart from justice, human rights, and fundamental freedoms. (2) The reduction and abolition of atomic weapons cannot be separated from effective inspection and control, nor in isolation from other armaments. (3) The goal of independence and freedom for subject and colonial peoples is best reached through processes of law and order and by free election under international control.

The contacts we have already had with the church leaders in the Soviet Union have been worth while. Despite many and difficult differences we found important common ground as Christians. We look forward to a continuation of conversations in the United States in June. We were courteously received in Russia and we hope to reciprocate here. A beginning has been made. Under the guidance and power of God we believe the churches of Jesus Christ may be used for the reconciling and salvation of the nations.

* * *

THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN THE PROTESTANT MINISTRY

The Lutheran Bishop of Trondheim in Norway, Arne Fjellbu, recently published a series of articles on the position of women in the Protestant churches (1) in connection with the current debate in the Nordic countries on women as ministers of religion. The discussion has been provoked by liberal Protestants and even by professed agnostics in the name of emancipation and full equality between the sexes, and the issue has been a source of embarrassment to responsible church leaders.

Bishop Fjellbu was a member of the Commission on Women's Work in the Church, instituted by the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948. Apart from some Scandinavian works on the subject, he refers mainly to a book written by Dr. Kathleen Bliss entitled, *The*

---

(1) *Aftenposten,* February 2nd - 7th, Oslo.

Service and Status of Women in the Churches (1952), and to a publication by the Commission itself, with the title, *A Study of Man-Woman Relationship* (1952). In the course of his articles, he gives the following review of the situation today in the representative Protestant groups.

In the Church of England, the problem was taken up by the 250 bishops attending the Lambeth Conference in 1920. It was decided then to allow women entrance to all the committees that were open to laymen and to institute the office of deaconess. Anglican deaconesses are expected to engage in active pastoral work, like preaching, counselling, preparing youth for Confirmation, and even presiding at certain religious functions. They are 'ordained' by the bishop. Their work was especially appreciated during the last war.

In the Congregationalist communities in England, there were recently twenty women ministers with the same functions as their male colleagues. The Presbyterian Church in England also gives the opportunity to women to enter the ministry, but as late as 1952 none of them had volunteered. The same is the case in the English Methodist Church. The Baptists, in their turn, had three women ministers listed in their statistics for England in 1950.

The Church of Scotland is somewhat more conservative than the Church of England in so far as it has accepted the 'order' of deaconess, but excludes women from the main church councils.

In Germany women may become *Pfarrgehilfinnen* and *Vikarinnen.* A certain theological preparation is required for the latter whose functions seem to correspond to those of the English deaconesses. There is, however, a strong tendency to expand the responsibilities of the *Frau Vikarin,* and in East Germany she may now legally celebrate all religious functions in any emergency, including the confection and distribution of communion. In this connection, Bishop Dibelius has stated that the necessary state of emergency is permanent in the East Germany of today.

In Switzerland only some of the Cantons have *Gemeinde helferinnen* and *Pfarrhelferinnen,* and then with the particular functions that they are given by their respective church councils. In France only a few of the denominations have female ministers. In the Netherlands in 1950 there were 18 women ministers among the Mennonites, 11 among the Remonstrants, and four among the Lutherans; while the Dutch Reformed Church had none.

In the United States a great number of dominations have women employed in pastoral work. The Evangelical Lutheran Church has none.

Of the strongly Lutheran Nordic countries, Finland is where women have been given the best opportunities in this respect. About 200 women have taken theological degrees, and some 50 of them are working full time in their church. They are, however, not given the status of a pastor. In Sweden the bishops recently recommended the creation

of positions for "parish assistants", corresponding to those occupied by the 50 Finnish women. The final decision there must, of course, be made by the government.

After a law had been passed by the Danish Parliament allowing for full equality between the sexes on the ecclesiastical level, the Bishop of Fyn ordained three women in 1948. The fact greatly disturbed the Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops of that year when they discussed the prospects of eventual intercommunion between the two churches. The Primate of the Danish church assured them that it would be only "a passing episode". Today, however, the Minister of Church Affairs, a woman herself, is attempting to force through the appointment of another of her sex as minister of a parish. This can be done only by separating the parish in question from its present diocese where the bishop refuses to 'ordain' her, and placing it under the jurisdiction of another and more 'progressive' bishop.

In Norway, Parliament this year will most probably pass a law that would open the way for women to all church appointments and that would thereby, as it is thought, bring an end to the last discrimination against women in Norwegian public life.

What is the position of Bishop Fjellbu in the face of this situation? He first of all seeks comfort both in the Bible and in Tradition. In St. Paul he rightly finds a great champion of women through his insistence that there is "no more male and female" (Gal. 3, 28). Bishop Fjellbu finds no contradiction between these words and those of I Corinthians, 14, 34-35 and I Timothy, 2, 11-12, where women are urged to be silent in the churches, and thinks that the words must be seen against the background of the fact that through the centuries as in our own day, women have often been accepted as preachers and as teachers of the Christian religion.

The Norwegian churchman proceeds to refer to an ancient institution of deaconess in the Eastern churches where women were allowed to instruct female catechumens and, according to one source, even to bring the consecrated Host to sick women. This institution disappeared, always according to Bishop Fjellbu, when female monasticism began developing. He mentions in this connection that women attained great influence in church affairs and gives as an example the fact that the mother abbess would rank after the bishop in English medieval synods.

Surprisingly enough, this is all that he has to tell us about the rôle of women in the Catholic Church. He enlarges on Florence Nightingale as the pioneer of a rôle for women in the social life of the church without the least suggestion that a multitude of Catholic women through all the centuries have worked as the respected helpers of the clergy in the caring for the sick, the assistance of the needy, the religious instruction of children and adults, and in a great variety of missionary and apostolic endeavors. Furthermore, the perfect religious equality of the

sexes is probably most convincingly demonstrated by the authority in spiritual matters acquired by so many outstanding women saints.

In this way, by passing over in silence the Catholic teaching that the only social functions reserved to men by divine right are the strictly liturgical cult and the jurisdiction that is necessarily connected with it, Bishop Fjellbu fails to identify the true terms of the problem. In addition, he likewise makes the historical mistake of hailing Luther as a champion of women's rights in the church. Examining the relevant passages in the Bishop's articles, Luther's championship is seen, however, to consist in something that Catholics have never thought of denying, namely, that men and women have the same human nature and thereby share in the same universal priesthood, in the sense referred to by St. Peter. The statements to this effect are taken from the context of Luther's polemics against the idea of an ordained priesthood. When the latter turns to the determination of the part to be played by women inside his own church, he bluntly declares that the pastoral vocation, as all other active functions in the social sphere, is reserved to men, while the place of women is in the home.

What, then, is the conclusion reached by Bishop Fjellbu on the question of women ministers? It is clear, first of all, that he himself does not favor the idea and that he thinks that the interest of the Church would be far better served if attention and efforts were directed to the development of woman's participation in other capacities in the social life of their churches. As for the doctrinal side of the question, he finds no intrinsic difficulty. He insists, however, that the decision remains with the Church and that one should abide by that decision, trusting in Christ's promise about the continued guidance of the Holy Spirit (John, 16, 12-13). "It is the Church itself that must decide if a tradition of the Church is to be altered, and one individual bishop does not, in my opinion, represent the whole Church."

Apart from the implication that there are no unalterable traditions relating back to the direct institution by Christ Himself, Bishop Fjellbu's words may be taken as a positive affirmation of the value of tradition, a reality that is too little appreciated by Protestant theologians. But who, then, is authorized to decide on behalf of the Church that it is time to alter a tradition? According to Dr. Fjellbu, it is the meeting of the six Norwegian Lutheran bishops. This remarkable conclusion is reached through a rather parochial abstraction from all Christians other than the three million Norwegian Lutherans. But how can this little flock, only about one in three hundred among the Christians of the world, have the right to break a universal tradition? This question is evaded by Fjellbu who limits his attention to the ecclesiastical tradition of Norway. But in this significant limitation there is also the element of expansion, related to the traditional Protestant outlook; for Fjellbu here refers to a tradition dating back some 900 years, thereby giving expression to a solidarity with the five cen-

turies of Catholic Christianity that preceded what is regularly conceived of as a break.

Another part of the Bishop's argumentation likewise transcends the traditional Lutheran position. He is well aware that the meeting of the six bishops has no power of decision whatever in a state church like the Norwegian. Why, then, refer at all to the bishops' conclave? His answer is that they have the responsibility for the 'ordination' of the candidates appointed by the government, and "without ordination no one can become a priest." This is a far cry from the universal priesthood of Luther, even though, of course, Fjellbu has a very vague idea of the sacramental implications of the Christian priesthood. He recalls another recent occasion where the concept of 'ordination' proved useful in the defence of ecclesiastical institutions, namely, in the fight of the Norwegian Church against Nazi infiltration during the German occupation.

There is little or no doubht that the liberal Norwegian State will have its way in this question. Two of the six bishops have already expressed their agreement with the proposed amendment regarding female appointments to church positions; and when even a champion of 'tradition' and 'ordination' like Bishop Fjellbu finds no doctrinal objections against it, as he reveals in these articles in *Aftenposten,* there are no prospects of any 'ordination strike' on the part of the bishops.

The question remains — how should Catholics consider this and similar developments inside Protestant circles ? No doubt, they represent victories of humanism over the faith of the groups in question. But there is no need of fresh lamentations, as the present events can be regarded as further manifestations of a defeat in a struggle for the faith that for these groups was lost already 400 years ago. What happens is simply that the Protestant communities are gradually brought to the realization that they possess no ordained priests whatever. The social functions that so far have been taken care of by men can without any collision with doctrinal realities be entrusted to women. Where the religious services are not simple memories of one or another side of the life of Christ, they may often be expressions of a natural religion. There is no reason, then, why women should not preside at such religious acts, especially since they do not take on any greater importance by being performed by men.

The introduction of women into these functions may hasten the day when Protestants begin longing for the sacramental services of truly ordained priests, of 'other Christs', who will not only minister to them the words that are mirrored in the pages of the Bible, but who will forgive their sins, give them the Bread of Life, and lead them on to their sanctification with the power and authority of Christ Himself.

EDWARD D. VOGT

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

London Interdenominational Meeting Discusses Reunion Issues

Continuing its practice of past years, the Anglican Church Union sponsored a unity meeting in London during the January Octave of Prayer at which three main speakers discussed various phases of the problem of Christian disunion. Those invited to address the meeting were: Canon C. K. Sansbury, Anglican Warden of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury; Fr. Kenneth Allan, who represented the Roman Catholic position; and the Rev. Donald Lee, a Methodist minister.

Reminding his listeners that differences relating to the unity of Christians and the nature of the Church went very deep, Canon Sansbury warned against any superficial optimism. However, he pointed to various developments in recent times which engender hope for future progress. The first of these he mentioned as being a revival in the study and the reading of the Bible throughout Christendom. The second factor at work was the remarkable recovery of the doctrine of the Church as the mystical body of Christ and the awareness that God did not intend that Christians should remain isolated from one another. The third hopeful element was that the wide divergence on the doctrine of the Eucharist originating with the Reformation showed signs of being resolved. In conclusion, Canon Sansbury said: "It is only as we come nearer to our Lord, both corporately and as individuals, that we shall rise above ingrained prejudice, the memory of past wrongs, sloth, and narrowness."

Fr. Kenneth Allan, in his discourse, emphasized the necessity of facing the realities of Christian disunity. He said that the attitude of Roman Catholics toward those who were separated from them was likened to *apartheid,* but this charge was due to misunderstanding. "It is hard for a Protestant," declared Fr. Allan, "to realize that a Roman Catholic, when he says the creed, believes that the Roman Catholic Church *is* the Holy Catholic Church, and that the Holy See is as much a part of the divine constitution as episcopacy. We believe that those who leave the Church do not remain a part of it, but have cut themselves off from it."

The Catholic speaker said that he and his co-religionists could not accept the Ecumenical Movement without definite reservations, although there was much within it that they could accept and commend. "It may appear," concluded Fr. Allan, "that by glossing over or ignoring difficulties, you can make progress — it is possible for an oecumenist to be untrue to his principles or to forget them. But face vital differences, bring them to the light, and then make up your mind that, whatever happens, they will not be a source of resentment."

The Rev. Donald Lee, in his turn, expressed the opinion that each tradition had its own particular contribution to make towards the realization of unity. Addressing himself to the Nonconformists, he felt

that their contribution could well be the practice of extempore prayer for that intention. It was the speaker's further conviction that the cause of unity would be served best by individuals striving to grow in prayer self-discipline, and holiness. *(Ch. Times)*

* * *

Conference Planned for Promoting Prayer for Unity

At a meeting sponsored in London on January 20 by three Anglican religious communities and other interested groups, plans were discussed for the formation of a permanent conference to promote prayer for Christian unity. The representatives taking part were from the Community of St. John the Evangelist, the Community of the Resurrection, the Society of St. Francis, and from the Methodist and Congregational denominations.

The statement issued at the end of the meeting contained the resolutions that:

"An interdenominational consultative conference be formed to promote prayer for unity and in particular the observance of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity from January 18 to 25 each year;

"the conference be known as the Conference for Promoting Prayer for Unity, and consist of persons and representatives of organisations who are able to further its objects, particularly in the councils of religious bodies, in the publication of articles in magazines, etc., and in the production and dissemination of literature to suit denominational needs;

"the conference meet annually to exchange information and to consider any matters affecting prayer for unity."

Commenting on this endeavour, the Anglican *Church Times* declared editorially: "If the annual observance (of the Octave) has a danger, it is that of putting a period to prayer for unity; that Christians might forget their obligations when the week is over; that it might become an annual formality. No serious Christian will fall into this error, but it is partly because of this danger that we welcome the initiative... of forming a conference for promoting prayer for Christian unity. Another reason for welcoming this move is that it is to be on a wide basis, embracing several Christian bodies. Every Christian body shares the responsibility of separation; all should bring their penitential prayers, and their virtues, too, to the task of healing. For in the matter of Christian unity, as in all things, more will be wrought by prayer than by controversy."

* * *

Executive Committee of World Council Meets in Australia

The important Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches met to discuss its ecumenical program at Gilbulla, Australia

from February 6 to 11. This marked the first time that a major meeting of this kind has ever taken place in the Southern Hemisphere.

On the agenda for consideration by members of the committee were the following subjects, among others: ethnic and racial relations, the prevention of war in an atomic age, the place of a Christian in modern society, inter-church aid, religious liberty, and the text of the letter from the Patriarch of Moscow in reply to the communication sent him from Davos, Switzerland, last year by the Central Committee of the W. C. C.

One of the most important decisions reached at Gilbulla had to do with the location of the next Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1960. The committee members voiced their preference for an Asian site, with probabilities pointing to Ceylon. This is a provisional choice, however, since the final decision lies with the Central Committee. It was likewise confirmed at the meeting that the latter committee would be holding its sessions this summer at Matrahaza, near Budapest, and the delegates voted to proceed with the plans for it.

Besides the sittings of the Executive Committee itself, an imposing program of activities sponsored by the World Council was carried out in Gilbulla and in other provincial cities of Australia. Of these, the principal event was an elaborate Festival of Faith which took place on February 4 on the Royal Show Ground in Sydney before an estimated attendance of 75,000 persons among whom was Prime Minister, Robert Gordon Menzies, who was invited as guest of honour. Massed choirs, a youth demonstration, and speeches by different church leaders formed the major part of the Festival. Other activities at Sydney included a consultation of more than 100 Australian churchmen at the University during the first week of February and a series of public meetings in the Town Hall. There the four main speakers to take the platform were: Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, Dr. Leslie Cooke, and the Rev. Philip Potter.

A few days after the meeting of the Executive Committee, a cabinet reception was held for its members at the capital city of Canberra, and this was followed by luncheon at the Parliament House.

(EPS)

* * *

Further Preparations for United States Faith and Order Conference

Plans for the North American Conference on Faith and Order to be held at Oberlin College in Ohio next year are continuing apace. The meeting, which will be co-sponsored by the National Council of Churches and the Canadian Council, is being promoted for the "prayerful study of problems connected with the unity of the Church" and is expected to draw at least 500 delegates from the different American and Canadian denominations. Over thirty of these so far have elected to send representatives.

At present fourteen United States and two Canadian study groups are laying the groundwork for future discussion, and a guide for the delegates is being written by Dr. Paul Minear, the secretary on Study and Programme. The latter has defined the objectives of these groups as being: "the shaping of an ecumenical mind, the patient wrestling with subtle antagonisms, and the gradual development of togetherness in thought and action."

To correlate the forthcoming conference with the work of the World Council, the secretary of the Faith and Order Commission, Dr. J. Robert Nelson, will meet with the study groups in ten American and Canadian cities and later with the Committee on Arrangements in New York City. *(EPS)*

* * *

Anglican Church Union Issues Statement on Church Relations

The Church Union, a prominent Anglo-Catholic organization which promotes prayer and work for Christian unity, has recently issued a statement in which it defines its basis for unionistic efforts and declares its stand with reference to the Church of South India. The text of the declaration reads as follows:

"We bring to the notice of all Christian men our belief that Christ's Commission to His Apostles (John 20 : 21) has been handed on by them and their successors in the Catholic Church through prayer with the laying on of hands, and will be so handed on for ever, until the Christ returns in glory. We therefore believe that his commission, embodied in the primitive orders of bishop, priest, and deacon, is an integral part of that tradition of faith and order, which any body should possess which claims communion and fellowship with the historic Catholic Church of God.

"We believe this divine and apostolic institution to have been revealed by God, not only for the decent and reverent ruling of His Church, but also for the effectual dispensation of His word and sacraments.

"We believe that this dominical commission has been handed down in unbroken succession from the Apostles and has been so maintained throughout the history of the Church of England.

"We declare that the Preface to the Ordinal of the Book of Common Prayer contains a true statement of the historic Catholic faith in this matter.

"The inauguration of the Church of South India on lines which the Church Union has consistently condemned confronted the Church of England with a difficult and perplexing situation. While the majority of the Committee for the Defence of Church Principles, which has watched the situation anxiously for many years, has, after careful study of the Report of the Joint Committee, found itself able to accept the resolutions of the Convocations, nevertheless deep anxiety,

CAREY S. THOMAS LIBRARY
DENVER CONSERVATIVE BAPTIST SEMINARY

which cannot be dismissed as unreasonable, continues to be felt by many; and it is plain to all that some of the regulations are open to abuse.

"The Church Union will oppose any attempt to extend the permissions given under the existing regulations, and will press that they shall be interpreted in the Catholic spirit as expressed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his Presidential Address to the Canterbury Convocation in October. The Union will be ever ready to succour and help any of its priest members who may be concerned in the practice of the new regulations.

"The Church Union welcomes the statement of the Archbishops that the South India scheme will not be taken as a model for future action; and since unity must be unity in Catholic truth, it affirms that if this truth is to be duly presented, there must be Catholic participation in all conversations aiming at reunion.

"In view of the defects and anomalies to which the Report of the Joint Committees of the Convocations draws particular attention, the Union urges that the authorities of the Church of South India be further pressed by the Convocations to give immediate attention to these irregularities."

* * *

An Open Letter by Anglo-Catholics on the Church of South India

Some ten years ago when the possibility of accepting the South India scheme was being vigorously debated in England, an open letter was sent to Archbishop William Temple by the heads of the male orders of Anglican religious with the threat of secession if the plan met with approval. Last year, following the decision of Convocations to accept the scheme, the heads of prominent Anglican communities of men made public a declaration in which they affirmed their support of that decision. In view of the earlier stand, this announcement caused considerable surprise in Anglo-Catholic circles in England.

One of the rebuttals to the above-mentioned declaration came in the form of an open letter by ten Anglo-Catholic clergymen belonging to the province of York. A relevant part of this letter, as quoted in the *Church Times,* states: "Something has sapped the lifeblood of Anglo-Catholicism. It is now almost unrecognizable as the great force of the days of the first Anglo-Catholic Congress, and there is a paralysing lethargy among the laity. We believe it is due to the blandishments of compromise, or comprehensiveness, an infection which, with respect, Reverend Fathers, appears to have influenced the thought expressed in your statement. Catholics can never be content to accept the place offered them as a mere sect or influence within a comprehensive Anglicanism. Catholicism, and Catholicism alone, is the true faith of the Church of England."

CAREY S. THOMAS LIBRARY
DENVER CONSERVATIVE BAPTIST SEMINARY
P. O. BOX 10,000

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

World-wide Tribute Marks Pope's Anniversary

The twofold anniversary on March 2 of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII's birthday and of his election to the papacy was the occasion of world-wide manifestations in his honor. Religious services, specially arranged programs, articles in the press, and other activities marked the event in many places throughout the world.

At Rome itself the tribute paid to the Holy Father took on a varied aspect. On the morning of his birthday, two hundred elementary school children of Rome, representing some eighteen countries, were the first to be received in audience by Pope Pius, who followed with great interest their songs and recitations. This was followed immediately afterwards by a reception for members of the College of Cardinals. Subsequently the Pope received a delegation composed of the Cardinal Vicar of Rome, the Prefect of the Vatican Library, the Mayor of Rome, Fr. Agostino Gemelli, O.F.M., Professor A. Severi, and Count Wladimir D'Ormesson who is the vice dean of the diplomatic corps at the Vatican. The latter deputation presented as a gift to Pope Pius a large volume of over 500 pages, edited by the Pontifical Academy of Sciences and made up of thirty-three essays by scholars of different countries dealing with various phases of the present pontificate. Later in the day, the Holy Father imparted his blessing to the many thousands who had assembled in St. Peter's Square to pay him homage.

Meanwhile thousands of letters and telegrams arrived at Vatican City from all over the world with greetings for the Pope's birthday.

Typical of the esteem manifested towards the Holy Father by the world press was an editorial published in the *New York Times* for March 2. "One does not need to be a Catholic," it began, "to feel and to express a sense of deep pleasure in congratulating Pope Pius XII today on his eightieth birthday. It is also the anniversary of his election to the Papacy seventeen years ago.

"In these years," continued the editorial, "Pope Pius has won a place in history as well as in the religious life of today which places him among the most important Pontiffs of modern centuries. He had to face the travail of World War II, which began only six months after the then Cardinal Pacelli was elected. His first encyclical, on October 27, 1939, was a brave and outspoken condemnation of totalitarianism. At that moment he was facing the tragic destruction of Catholic Poland by the German Nazis. Any totalitarian philosophy—Fascist or Communist—is a danger to religion because all elements in society are subordinated to the state. Today it is atheistic communism which is the major enemy.

"Pius XII has gone on through these seventeen years with a serenity and great-heartedness that have kept the Church strong and have made him, personally, the exemplification of all that is saintly to his Catholic flock. His simple goodness of character has warmed the hearts of all Christendom, for it is universal in its depth and scope. His charm has completely won those fortunate enough to meet or know him. His intelligence needs no comment, for he came to the Papacy from a brilliant career as Secretary of State, and his vast erudition and knowledge of languages are evident in all his work. To Roman Catholics there is the added fact that he is as profoundly and sincerely religious as a man can be.

"A Pontiff," concludes the editorial ,"is by the nature of his position, a citizen of the world as well as, to Roman Catholics, the successor of St. Peter. In the case of Pius XII one must add the homage and respect due to a man who has done nothing but good in a post of great power. That he should have recovered so well from his recent desperate illness and be celebrating his eightieth birthday in a state of health is something that brings deep satisfaction to many millions in many lands today."

Pope Speaks of Religion and Culture to Archaeologists

Religion is independent of culture, but every true culture is bound to religion and suffers without it, His Holiness Pope Pius told the members of the International Union of Archaeological Institutes early in March. The Holy Father's address to the Union was a development of the ideas he had expressed in his allocution to delegates attending the Tenth International Congress of Historical Sciences last September. (Cfr. *Unitas*, vol. VII, pp. 154-162).

At that time the Pope said: "The Catholic Church does not identify herself with any culture; her very essence prevents her from doing so. She is nevertheless prepared to maintain connections with all cultures." The reason for this attitude he explained as being the radical independence of religion from culture.

The Church's Divine Founder, the Holy Father told the archaeologists, "did not give her a mandate with any cultural purpose. The end which Christ assigned to her is strictly religious... The Church can never lose sight of this strictly religious, supernatural end. The meaning of all her activities down to the last canon of her code (of law) can only be to concur with that end directly or indirectly."

Christianity does not seek a pure spiritualism, however, the Pope observed, for that would be inhuman. "The perfect Christian is also a perfect man, just as there was no one more completely man than the God-man, Jesus Christ Himself."

Despite the fact that the Church is independent of culture, His Holiness continued, in carrying out her mission she has had a profound cultural influence through "the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the educa-

tion of people to Christian civilization, and her charitable and social accomplishments." From the beginning the Church has instilled certain principles into humanity, quietly but durably, affecting cultural life and profoundly modifying it from within.

Here the Pope cited the following important contributions the Church has made to man's cultural progress: "the orientation of the whole of human existence towards a personal God before whom man is like a child towards his father; the respect for the personal worth of the individual: men are all equal by their nature, their origin, their destiny, without distinction of class or of nationality; they are all brothers and sisters in Jesus Christ; even the union of men among themselves and the establishment of social life, not under the effect of instinctive impulse on the part of the masses nor by the will of a dictator, but under the influence of Christ. Further effects of the Church's teaching also extend to the philosophy of government, the right of private property, the dignity of manual labor, and to marriage.

The Church, which made these principles triumph, contributed therefore to the development of Western culture, the Pope concluded. These principles, which the Church has transmitted and kept alive, are in reality the soul of that culture. The latter, then, will maintain itself and bear fruit as long as it remains faithful to them. *(Oss. Romano)*

Bishop Dibelius Pays Visit to the Holy Father

Dr. Otto Dibelius, Lutheran Bishop of Berlin and president of the Council of the Evangelical Churches of Germany, was received in audience by Pope Pius XII on January 23. Dr. Dibelius, who was visiting Rome on his way to a World Council meeting in Australia, was accompanied by his son who is himself a high official of the Lutheran Church. No details of the visit were made public, but it is believed that the religious situation in East Germany was one of the topics discussed. *(NC)*

* * *

THE UNITED STATES

Annual Fordham Conference on Eastern Rites

The eighteenth annual Conference on Eastern Rites and Liturgies sponsored by Fordham University took place on March 9 and 10 in New York. The theme treated this year was "Christ's Church and Schism." Lecture sessions were held this year for the first time at Regis Auditorium in mid-town New York for the greater convenience of participants.

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Peter P. Tuohy, President of the Pontifical Mission "Pro Palestina" and National Secretary of the Catholic Near East

Association, was chairman of the lecture sessions, at which Bishop Philip J. Furlong of New York presided. Principal speakers were Fr. Clement C. Englert, C.SS.R., professor at the Institute of Contemporary Russian Studies at Fordham University, and Bishop James H. Griffiths, Auxiliary of New York. Fr. Englert's talk was on the subject "Early Attempts at Disunity," and weighed the historical and theological factors that led to disruption among the body of believers and the separation from the Church of discordant elements. Bishop Griffiths, who spoke on "Modern Assaults at the Church of Christ" noted the technique of totalitarian governments in fomenting discord among believers, with the eventual purpose of severing groups from unity with the central authority of the Church. He also showed how divisions already existing were used by such powers for their own ends, with the objective of solidifying separation and thwarting any efforts towards reunion. The collusion of certain ecclesiastical leaders of dissident groups with communist powers in the occupied countries to "abrogate" past unions with Rome and "terminate" the existence of Eastern rite Catholic groups is a case in point.

On March 10, the Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom was pontifically celebrated in the Cathedral of St. Patrick in New York by the Most Rev. Nicholas T. Elko, Apostolic Exarch of Pittsburgh, with His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, presiding at the throne.

The Fordham Conference of Eastern Rites and Liturgies had its origin in very simple fashion in 1948 when a group of earnest University students decided to put into practice the directive of Pope Pius XI, who, speaking through the Sacred Congregation for Seminaries and Universities, called for the dedication of a special day each year to the Christian East. In this they were aided substantially by the advice of Father Gerard C. Donnelly, S.J. of Fordham, and Father Thomas J. McMahon, then professor of Church History at Dunwoodie.

For a good number of years the Executive Committee functioned under the direction of Monsignor McMahon and Fr. Robert L. Ryan, S.J., also of Fordham. The Conference never lacked the enthusiastic participation of members of the original group, notably Mr. Edmund C. Burke, Mr. Henry J. O'Grady, and Mr. Philip Weiler, the latter now secretary of the Executive Committee, to ensure ever wider attendance at the gatherings. Cardinal Spellman has always been a sympathetic friend and counsellor to the Conference since his elevation to the See of New York.

In the course of years, other Catholic institutions of the metropolitan area have associated themselves with this Fordham Conference program. These now include St. John's University, St. Francis College, and Cathedral College in Brooklyn, Manhattan College and Catedral College in New York, St. Peter's College in Jersey City, and the many educational centers for women in the city and suburbs. Members

of the General Committee of the Conference also play their role in promoting its purposes, though some are now a long distance away from New York, as Fr. John Songster, S.J., one of the initial organizers, now in Munich, Germany, and Fr. Dunstan Donovan, S.A. in Rome..

Attendance at the Conference sessions, which have attracted interest in those concerned about unity, even in the separated groups, was never a problem after the first few years. Keating Hall at Fordham proved too small for the lectures, which now take place in a more central and commodious auditorium. The liturgy associated with the Conference was early transferred from the University Chapel to the great Cathedral of the Archdiocese of New York. The Byzantine Rite in various languages, the Maronite, Chaldean, Armenian, and Syro-Malabar rites have all been exemplified on the devotional side of the program during the past eighteen years.

American Presbyterians Vote Approval of Women Ministers

At a meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (northern branch) held at Philadelphia early in March, it was revealed that the majority of the presbyteries of that body had voted in favor of admitting women to the ministry. This marked the third attempt to win approval for the measure. Twice before, in 1930 and 1947, the vote had been in the negative. The latest tabulation showed that out of a total of 257 presbyteries, 156 had approved the proposal as against 27 which voiced disapproval. The others had not yet submitted their decision.

It remains now for the General Assembly to give final enactment to the step when it convenes late in May, after which the measure will be embodied in the constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Latest statistics indicate that this denomination has approximately 6000 ordained ministers and 2,526,129 members.

In reporting the move, the *New York Times* also published recent statistics on ordained or licensed women ministers in the United States, and gave the number as being 5,791. Two-thirds of these are to be found in the following four bodies: The Church of God, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, the Volunteers of America, and the Salvation Army.

* * *

ENGLAND

Anglican Church Assembly Debates Reform of Ecclesiastical Courts

The spring session of the Church Assembly in England held in February devoted its attention chiefly to discussion of a proposed general reform of ecclesiastical (i.e. Church of England) courts. The Canon Law Steering Committee presented its findings in response to

a long-felt desire to simplify ecclesiastical procedures in connection with the revision of Anglican Canon Law begun in 1947. One type would deal with "conduct cases"; the other with "ecclesiastical causes reserved," that is, cases in which doctrinal, ceremonial, or ritual matters are involved. From the decision of the "conduct cases" there would be no right of appeal on the part of clergymen to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Discussion on the advisability of eliminating this right of appeal from the decisions of courts of "ecclesiastical causes reserved" also was spirited, especially in view of the complex nature of the Church of England, whose head, "the King's Most Excellent Majesty, acting according to the laws of the realm, is the highest power under God in this kingdom, and has supreme authority over all persons in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil" (Canons of 1603: 1, 2, 3, 7. Text not changed in current revision: 1947, I, VI, X).

Supporters of the proposal to terminate the right of appeal, who were ultimately in the majority, stressed the purely civil nature of the Judicial Committee, a body that in the past has issued vindications of persons accused in doctrinal matters (notably in the Gorham Institution case of 1850, where a clergyman who refused to accept the doctrine of baptismal regeneration and had been denied institution to a benefice in the Diocese of Exeter by the ordinary, was ordered installed in the living by the Committee, after an appeal from the decision of the Court of Arches.)

Canon W.E. Kemp of Oxford noted that for a large section of the clergy the Judicial Committee has "no moral authority." The Archbishop of Canterbury strove to temper the spirit that would deprive this civil body of its power to render final decisions in ecclesiastical matters. He said in part: "There is a partnership between the Church and State, whether you like it or not. When we are operating a new set of Canons, we must have some regard for the authority of the Queen in Council.

"We are not going to be governed by fear of what the Privy Council did, under different circumstances, a hundred years ago. The world is full of bodies unwilling to give up power. In view of the kind of things I have said, would it be wise to demand complete and utter separation from the Privy Council? It is not improper that we should have some regard to the Queen's authority. And the will of the Queen is the Queen in Council. And the Privy Council is the Queen in Council."

The motion to retain the right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in ecclesiastical cases in the canonical revision now in process, strongly favoured by the Archbishop, was defeated. In its ultimate decision, the Church Assembly voted unanimously for the appointment of a commission to prepare a measure to establish a

revised system of courts in accordance with the recommendations of the Steering Committee.

It is to be noted that the Church Assembly, which was created by the Enabling Act of 1918 and consists of all the diocesan bishops, all the archdeacons, and elected representatives of the clergy and laity, can only *suggest* legislation to the House of Commons. In view of the departure from traditional norms of the Church-State relationship the proposed termination of appeal would represent, and in consideration of the numbers and personalities of those in opposition to the change, it seems unlikely that this effort to curtail the prerogative of a purely civil tribunal as the ultimate arbiter in matters of doctrine, ceremonial and ritual, as well as in "conduct cases" will ever be passed by Parliament. (from notices in the *Church Times, Church of England Newspaper,* and the *Catholic Herald)*

* * *

GERMANY

Further Straining of Relations between Church and State in East Germany

Accusing church leaders of "disturbing the peace" and of undermining government policy, officials of the German Democratic Republic have resorted to sterner measures in their attempt to dominate Catholic and Protestant Churches. Since February especially, tension between Church and State has been mounting as the government has intensified its anti-Christian propaganda, and placed further obstacles in the way of the free exercise of religion.

One of the latest political measures which has greatly concerned both Catholics and Protestants is the "Decree for the safeguarding of order and stability in the educational process in the Democratic schools." In virtue of this decree, religious instruction of children must end at the elementary school level. The ruling goes even further by claiming supervision for the State over the education of youth both inside and outside school buildings. It thus becomes necessary for teachers of religion to obtain the approval of the local headmaster before being allowed to teach. The permission, if granted, must then be renewed at the end of three months. Other stipulations in the edict aim at rigid control by the Communist government over any religious education of the young.

Reaction to this decree on the part of church groups has been strong, and responsible leaders are fully prepared to resist the measure. At present an effort is being made by them to convince government leaders of the injustice of the situation with the hope that a relaxation of tension may come about. *(EPS)*

SWITZERLAND

Swiss Protestant Writer Decries Claim of Persecution in Colombia

While American newspapers have continued to publish reports of severe persecution of Protestants in Colombia, a Swiss Calvinist writer has taken a stand to the contrary. Writing in a winter number of the *Young Church (Jeune Eglise),* the organ of a youth movement of Swiss Calvinism, Hans U. Bretscher affirmed that after a year's residence in Medellin, Colombia, he had never been molested or discriminated against because of his religion.

Mr. Bretscher, further, had personally investigated allegations that in Colombia 53 Protestants had been martyred, 40 of their chapels destroyed, and 160 Protestant schools closed. These charges were made in the book entitled, *The Situation of Protestants in Catholic Countries,* edited by the late Dr. Arthur Frey, director of the Swiss Protestant news service. After a first-hand investigation of these incidents, Mr. Bretscher denied that they were the result of religious persecution. The real reason, he said, lay in the fact that in the period from 1949 to 1953, when the Conservative Party and its leader, Laureano Gomez, were in power, ruthless measures were adopted against the defeated Liberal Party. Members of that party, both Catholics and Protestants, lived in danger of their lives; and actually many of them were put to death and their property confiscated. This was true especially in rural areas where the majority of Protestants were to be found.

"I would like to remark on this subject," concluded Mr. Bretscher, "that one cannot ignore the facts; however, they must be considered in the light of the evolution of this country (Colombia) if one wishes to form an objective picture. One can hardly do so from the heart of the Zurich countryside. For that it is necessary to live in Colombia, to know and to understand its people." *(La Croix)*

* * *

NORWAY

Lutheran Bishop Criticizes Invasion by Sects

A former president of the World Council of Churches, Bishop Berggrav of Norway, has recently written an article in which he takes to task what he terms the "invasion of Europe" by sects from America. Writing in the Lutheran periodical *Church and Culture,* of which he is editor, Dr. Berggrav deplores the "wild fantasy" of groups like the Mormons and Jehovah's Witnesses. He does not hesitate to compare these groups to "pirates" and warns that their influence is all the more harmful because they cannot be reckoned as Christian bodies.

As factors which have contributed to the headway these sects have

made in Europe, Bishop Berggrav emphasizes mainly two: the divisions among Protestants, and the feeling of insecurity resulting from the last world war.

* * *

GREECE

Death of Archbishop Spyridon

His Beatitude, Archbishop Spyridon of Athens, Orthodox Primate of the Church of Greece, passed away on March 21 in his eightieth year. Elected to his position on July 4, 1949, he had actively administered the affairs of his Church until very shortly before his death. Previous to his coming to Athens, the late archbishop had served for many years as Metropolitan of Yannina.

A patriotic figure as well as a religious leader, Archbishop Spyridon had been imprisoned and sentenced to death under the Turks in 1913. He was eventually saved from this condemnation by the intervention of King Constantine. Again, in the earlier stages of the last war, he was first condemned to death by the Italians and later confined to prison by the Germans. His passing has deprived the Greek Orthodox Church of both a saintly and courageous leader. *(Katholike)*

* * *

INDIA

Asian Bishops Warn of Communist Designs

Meeting in Bangalore recently the Catholic Bishops of Asia released a statement in which they termed the imperialism of international communism as the "new and mortal enemy" of Asia. The statement followed sessions of the Catholic Bishops' Conference in India, which were also attended by other bishops of South-East Asia.

The declaration stated that just as the peoples of Asia protested against the "ancient evil of colonialism, so now they repudiate the efforts of Marxist communism to pervert Asia's movement towards liberation for its own sinister ends."

The Bishops called for the strengthening of the normal basis of Asian society—the family as the basic social unit, the village as the primary center of communal life, and sound agriculture as the foundation of developing economy. "Excessive and unbalanced industrialization, anti-social capitalism in all its forms, and domination of communism are destructive of Asia's traditions and must be resisted," they declared.

The newly-developed Asian societies, the message continued, were threatened not only by communist imperialism and the remnants of colonialism, but incipient national antagonism among various Asian peoples themselves.

"It would be a betrayal of the aspirations of Asia's millions if the final result of the struggle for national freedom should be an exaggerated nationalism," the Bishops declared. *(NC)*

* * *

INDONESIA

Recent Catholic Statistics

Catholics in Indonesia now number 1,076,318, or 1.3 per cent of the nation's approximately 80,000,000 people, according to new statistics released at Jakarta by the papal internunciature. An estimated 90 per cent of Indonesians are Moslems while the number of Protestants is calculated as being in the vicinity of 1,500,000.

Close to half of Indonesia's Catholics—530,102—are concentrated on Flores, an island of 16,450 square miles in the Lesser Sundas. The remainder are distributed throughout the rest of the area of 889,102 square miles.

Serving Indonesian Catholics are 1,085 priests, of whom 140 are native clergy. They are being assisted by 562 Brothers and 2,406 Sisters, many of whom staff the numerous Catholic schools which are attended by 325,616 students. *(Fides)*

* * *

BURMA

Burma's Premier Lauds Work of Catholic Church at Eucharistic Congress

Prime Minister U Nu told Burma's first National Eucharistic Congress at Rangoon that the "Catholic Church has been an ideal church in Burma." His speech is believed to be the most forthright tribute of praise ever given by a non-Christian Asian leader to the Catholic Church.

"As Prime Minister," U Nu stated, "I have three observations to make: first, the Catholic Church in Burma is loyal . . . ; second, the Catholic Church in Burma never dabbles in politics . . . and has consistently concerned itself with religion only; third, the Catholic Church in Burma, far from dividing the citizens, espouses the cause of national solidarity."

The Burmese Premier spoke in the presence of archbishops and bishops from Burma and five other Asian countries, foreign diplomats, and 30,000 Burma Catholics at a reception for the Papal Legate, His Eminence Valerian Cardinal Gracias, Archbishop of Bombay. *(NC)*

BOOK REVIEWS

THOMAS SARTORY, O.S.B. *Die oekumenische Bewegung und die Einheit der Kirche.* A study on ecumenical ecclesiology. Kyrios-Verlag, Meitengen bei Augsburg, 1955. Int - 8, pp. 232.

This work by Fr. Thomas Sartory, who has for a number of years been editor of the unionistic review, *Una Sancta Rundbriefe,* makes up the doctoral dissertation which he submitted to the University of Munich. In its pages the reader will find a truly scientific and theological treatment of the ecumenical problem — a treatment that is notably precise and profound, and developed in the light of the teaching of the Catholic Church.

The first part of this study is of an historical character. The author unfolds for us the principle phases of the Ecumenical Movement from its first beginnings to the present day, pausing from time to time to dwell upon the significant elements which bring into relief the conceptions of the unity of the Church as reflected in the various and changing opinions among those separated from Rome, particularly those belonging to Protestant denominations. Wisely enough, Fr. Sartory makes his observations from a well-determined point of view: the traditional concept of the unity of the Church of Christ. This occupies a central position in the extensive field of ecumenism and forms the real focus of all the different questions debated among the Christian confessions.

The horizon against which the author develops his dissertation is that of the Protestant world; the voice of the Orthodox is but rarely perceived, and then always in relation to Protestant opinions. The latter, in fact, are presented with a surprising wealth of information and with a remarkable mastery of varied material. This Fr. Sartory offers to his readers in systematized form and appends to it a copious bibliography, most of it in German but with a good number of French and English works as well. This part of the book alone would suffice to make the author's contribution welcome to many and a useful source of information to all who are interested in questions pertaining to Christian unity.

Fr. Sartory exhibits noteworthy ability in arriving at the nucleus of the opinions and theories advanced by Protestants and in recapitulating them along general lines in concise phraseology. A further merit of his method lies in the dialogue arrangement of the writers and works he cites—a technique that gives a dramatic touch to the development of his theme. Indeed, the entire book is a continuous dialogue: first between the different non-Catholic groups themselves and successively with Catholic theology. On every occasion, the writer clearly indicates the Catholic point of view, emphasizing not so much the more obvious divergences, but bringing to light the real root of the prob-

lem. By so doing, he is able to point out what is wanting to a number of basic principles and the unilateral intuitions which have provoked and directed the currents of thought among those who are separated from Mother Church. In this connection Fr. Sartory does not hesitate to suggest some new approaches on the part of Catholic theology, together with a different accentuation which would render the presentation of Catholic teaching more intelligible to our separated brethren, especially by avoiding a certain rigidity which he explains as a reaction against the errors opposed over the centuries.

The more burning questions are stressed by the author as being these: actual and *in voto* membership in the Church; the extension and limits of the Church; the *vestigia Ecclesiae;* the relation between the organism and the organization of the Church; and the relation between the hierarchical and juridical order and the personal element which is immediately subject to the inspirations of the Holy Spirit. The aspects of this treatment are many and varied, but at every turn there appears the same fundamental difference which is at the root of all the others: in Protestantism there is lacking the real significance of the basic values of the Incarnation and of creation itself. And this lack evidently depends upon its stand on justification and on grace. Justification remains as something too extrinsic, too forensic; and *pari passu,* grace is conceived of simply as a divine favour and not as a power which transforms the entire being of the human creature, causing it to be reborn as a "new creature" in Christ. Wanting to Protestantism, furthermore, is the complete Christological basis as it was laid down at the Council of Chalcedon: the fullness of the divinity and of humanity in perfect union in a living and particular being; first in Christ, but then also in the Church, where the human element, made fruitful by divine grace, on the ontological and juridical plane as well as the moral and mystical, becomes part of the pattern of the institutional and social form of the Church body, Fr. Sartory characterizes Protestant teaching on this subject as being an "abbreviated Christology" *(verkürzte Christologie).* It is evident that the structure of the Church universal in its integrity and unity would not be able to stand on such a restricted basis. It is necessary, then, first of all to make the proper adjustment at the deepest level of Protestantism, a thing which is much more imperative than any accommodation on the surface.

It is not to be wondered at that a treatment like this of a wide range of intricate problems should give rise to certain critical observations on the part of the conscientious reviewer. Although Fr. Sartory is very judicious in his statements, yet his book would gain in accuracy and effect if he were to avoid, or at least temper, one or the other of his expressions which seem too enthusiastic. The progress towards an ever more perfect understanding of revealed truth, as affirmed in the encyclical *Humani Generis,* is too diverse from that

realized within the Ecumenical Movement to make possible an immediate *rapprochement* (p. 15). The author's handling of another point also leaves something to be desired; this is where he refers to the unfortunate fact that our separated brethren in the ecumenical field, although admitting to a greater degree the necessity of doctrinal agreement, yet decisively reject the hierarchical and organizational unity as they see it in the Catholic Church. Here the author questions whether the later has effectively proclaimed in a convincing enough manner its own unity and Catholicity which it undoubtedly possesses. The reviewer feels that this query is unjustifiable, for in spite of all the historical imperfections, the Church has always been and still remains the *signum levatum inter nationes;* this has been so in every epoch, no matter how turbulent, for all who have been of good will and have not rejected the sufficiently evident witness of the Catholic Church. The fault is not of the latter, but of him who will not listen to her. Otherwise, not only would the Church be failing in her essential mission but Christ Himself in His promises. Indeed, the Church is fully conscious of this her prerogative. The fact remains, however, that only too often those who appeal to "Scripture alone" are oblivious to the divine truths which are clearly revealed in the pages of the Bible; the history of Protestantism can provide us with various examples in this respect.

Following the analysis which Fr. Sartory gives us of the encyclical *Mystici Corporis,* I fail to see that some of its points are as obscure as he suggests. It seems to me that in this matter it would have been better to have taken fuller account of the exceptionally clear explanation of real membership in the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, as proposed by Fr. Timothy Zapelena, S.J., in the second volume of his work, *De Ecclesia Christi,* Rome, 1954. (It may well be that this work is so recent that the best the author could do was to cite it in his bibliography). Neither am I in agreement with Fr. Sartory when he parallels the desire for membership *(votum)* of which the encyclical speaks, with the conscientiousness of ecumenical unity as it has been formed within the ambit of present-day ecumenicism (p. 146). *Mystici Corporis* refers to the desire which springs from good faith and from the state of grace in individuals, but it does not treat of separated communities as such. In this regard, even the author admits that at times in ecumenical circles today a *votum contra Ecclesiam catholicam* appears to be more evident than other manifestations; differences may be well-nigh innumerable, but on one point apparently all are in agreement—not to accept that which is offered by the Catholic Church.

Fr. Sartory's presentation of the place of ministers and preachers in the Protestant conception *(Amt)* is very well done (pp. 168-172); his practical and doctrinal evaluation, however, would require a more realistic approach and greater precision. Certainly, to designate the mini-

stry as belonging to the realm of the *prophetic* and the *charismatic* seems to me an unwarranted optimism (p. 172-3).

After having followed the author through a maze of bewildering opinions which still abound in the ecumenical field, we cannot help but be in full agreement with him when he concludes his study with the words of Pope Pius XI: "to hope against hope—even this our faith teaches us." Perhaps for the present no other avenue is open to us. This is very hard to acknowledge. It seems certain, at any rate, that the solution of the problems of disunion depends upon the infinite goodness of God, more than upon the will of men.

JOHN VODOPIVEC

ROGER AUBERT. *Problèmes de l'unité chrétienne: Initiation.* Collection Irenikon, Chevetogne. 125 pp.

This small volume by Abbot Aubert, with an introduction by Dom Lambert Beaudouin, is aptly called an "initiation" to unionistic problems. In a series of chapters—briefly done, but accurate and informative, a presentation is made of the actual state of the questions arising from disunion, together with a discussion of the Ecumenical Movement.

Christians are divided, while the will of Christ, the interest of the missions among pagans, and the struggle against materialism require that they should form but one body and one soul. The Catholic Church, with a mother's solicitude, seeks to hasten the return to her side of those many Christians whose ancestors abandoned her. For half a century now, those who are separated from the Church have been keenly conscious of the tragedy of the present situation, and are making praiseworthy efforts to remedy it. But the passing of centuries has multiplied the obstacles on the roads which lead to Rome. No Catholic, accordingly, can ignore a problem which occupies such an important place in contemporary life nor refuse his co-operation towards resolving it. With the author, we too wish the widest possible diffusion of these helpful pages among all who should be concerned with the questions with which they deal.

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.